

4987, for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of S. S. Field, city solicitor, Baltimore, Md., relating to equitable distribution of certain war material suitable for road-making purposes among the highway departments of the several States; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of United States Employment Service, Department of Labor, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of bill for appropriation for employment service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Board of Education of Dorchester County, Md., heartily indorsing Senate bill 4987, for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Russell Council, No. 65, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., and Bernardo Council, No. 1350, Knights of Columbus, Shelton, Conn., relating to self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Venice of American Chamber of Commerce, Venice, Cal., favoring exempting of outdoor amusements from the forms of taxation prescribed in the current revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of 600 citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., in favor of self-determination of their own government by the people of Ireland, as submitted by James F. Pyne, grand knight of Fitchburg council, Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Diamond State Grange No. 2, Patrons of Husbandry of Stanton, Del., favoring repeal of daylight saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Illinois State Federation, urging Gov. Stephens, of California, to procure for Thomas Mooney a new trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Farmers' National Council, urging serious consideration of the report on Senate bill 2812; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, petition of Engineers and Architects Association of Southern California, urging appropriation for reclamation work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Rotary Club, of Kirksville, Mo., recommending changing the name of the Panama Canal to Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Minnesota State vegetable growers, protesting against setting the clock ahead; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, relative to Government control, operation, and ownership of public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 15, 1919.

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1919.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Penrose	Smoot
Colt	Kenyon	Pittman	Swanson
Cummins	Kirby	Pollock	Thomas
France	Knox	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gay	Lenroot	Robinson	Watson
Hale	Lodge	Saulsbury	Weeks
Hardwick	McKellar	Sheppard	
Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Sherman	

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to state that my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce the absence in attendance upon committee of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is still confined at his home by ill-

ness, but is very greatly improved. I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained by illness.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is detained on official business. He will be in the Senate in a few minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I have been informed that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is seriously ill and therefore unable to attend the session.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have been requested to announce that the following Senators are absent engaged in the Committee on Indian Affairs: The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. KING, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. McNARY, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PAGE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. REED entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is detained in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15706) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 8625. An act to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12863. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

### LEAGUE OF NATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 389).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a request out of order. It is that the terms of the league of nations, printed in all the newspapers, may be printed in the Record and also as a Senate document for convenience and use.

Mr. PITTMAN. May I ask the Senator if he would object to including in his request that the speech of the President delivered at the time of the presentation of the terms of the league be also published along with the document he has referred to, so that the two may be read together?

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to its being printed, of course.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask that the President's address be so included.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest that the Senator from Nevada submit the request in conjunction with the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection at all to including it in my request.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the way I intended my suggestion, and I understand the Senator from Massachusetts has so modified his request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"COVENANT—PREAMBLE.

"In order to promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, the powers signatory to this covenant adopt this constitution of the league of nations.

"ARTICLE 1.

"The action of the high contracting parties under the terms of this covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of meeting of a body of delegates representing the high contracting parties, of meeting at more frequent intervals of an executive council, and of a permanent international secretariat to be established at the seat of the league.

"ARTICLE 2.

"Meetings of the body of delegates shall be held at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require for the purpose of dealing with matters within the sphere of action of the league. Meetings of the body of delegates shall be held at the seat of the league or at such other place as may be found convenient, and shall consist of representatives of the high contracting parties. Each of the high contracting parties shall have one vote but may not have more than three representatives.

"ARTICLE 3.

"The executive council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, together with representatives of four other States, members of the league. The selection of these four States shall be made by the body of delegates on such principles and in such manner as they think fit. Pending the appointment of these representatives of the other States, representatives of — shall be members of the executive council.

"Meetings of the council shall be held from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at whatever place may be decided upon, or, failing any such decision, at the seat of the league, and any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world may be dealt with at such meetings.

"Invitations shall be sent to any power to attend a meeting of the council at which matters directly affecting its interests are to be discussed, and no decision taken at any meeting will be binding on such powers unless so invited.

"ARTICLE 4.

"All matter of procedure at meetings of the body of delegates or the executive council, including the appointment of the committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the body of delegates or the executive council, and may be decided by a majority of the States represented at the meeting.

"The first meeting of the body of delegates and of the executive council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

"ARTICLE 5.

"The permanent secretariat of the league shall be established at —, which shall constitute the seat of the league. The secretariat shall comprise such secretaries and staff as may be required, under the general direction and control of a secretary general of the league, who shall be chosen by the executive council; the secretariat shall be appointed by the secretary general, subject to confirmation by the executive council.

"The secretary general shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the body of delegates or of the executive council.

"The expenses of the secretariat shall be borne by the States members of the league in accordance with appointment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

"ARTICLE 6.

"Representatives of the high contracting parties and officials of the league when engaged on the business of the league shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities, and the buildings occupied by the league or its officials or by representatives attending its meetings shall enjoy the benefits of extraterritoriality.

"ARTICLE 7.

"Admission to the league of States not signatories to the covenant and not named in the protocol hereto as States to be invited to adhere to the covenant requires the assent of not less than two-thirds of the States represented in the body of

delegates, and shall be limited to fully self-governing countries, including dominions and colonies.

"No State shall be admitted to the league unless it is able to give effective guaranties of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and unless it shall conform to such principles as may be prescribed by the league in regard to its naval and military forces and armaments.

"ARTICLE 8.

"The high contracting parties recognize the principle that the maintenance of peace will require the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and the enforcement by common action of international obligations, having special regard to the geographical situation and circumstances of each State; and the executive council shall formulate plans for effecting such reduction. The executive council shall also determine for the consideration and action of the several Governments what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament, and these limits, when adopted, shall not be exceeded without the permission of the executive council.

"The high contracting parties agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war lends itself to grave objections, and direct the executive council to advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of these countries which are not able to manufacture for themselves the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

"The high contracting parties undertake in no way to conceal from each other the condition of such of their industries as are capable of being adapted to warlike purposes or the scale of their armaments, and agree that there shall be full and frank interchange of information as to their military and naval programs.

"ARTICLE 9.

"A permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the league on the execution of the provisions of article 8 and on military and naval questions generally.

"ARTICLE 10.

"The high contracting parties undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the executive council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

"ARTICLE 11.

"Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the high contracting parties or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the league, and the high contracting parties reserve the right to take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

"It is hereby also declared and agreed to be the friendly right of each of the high contracting parties to draw the attention of the body of delegates or of the executive council to any circumstances affecting international intercourse which threaten to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

"ARTICLE 12.

"The high contracting parties agree that should disputes arise between them which can not be adjusted by the ordinary processes of diplomacy they will in no case resort to war without previously submitting the question and matters involved either to arbitration or to inquiry by the executive council and until three months after the award by the arbitrators or a recommendation by the executive council; and that they will not even then resort to war as against a member of the league which complies with the award of the arbitrators or the recommendation of the executive council.

"In any case under this article, the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the recommendation of the executive council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

"ARTICLE 13.

"The high contracting parties agree that whenever any dispute or difficulty shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole matter to arbitration. For this purpose the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed upon by the parties or stipulated in any convention existing between them. The high contracting parties agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that



may be rendered. In the event of any failure to carry out the award, the executive council shall propose what steps can best be taken to give effect thereto.

"ARTICLE 14.

"The executive council shall formulate plans for the establishment of a permanent court of international justice, and this court shall, when established, be competent to hear and determine any matter which the parties recognize as suitable for submission to it for arbitration under the foregoing article.

"ARTICLE 15.

"If there should arise between States members of the league any dispute likely to lead to rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration as above, the high contracting parties agree that they will refer the matter to the executive council; either party to the dispute may give notice of the existence of the dispute to the secretary-general, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof. For this purpose the parties agree to communicate to the secretary-general, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the executive council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

"Where the efforts of the council lead to the settlement of the dispute, a statement shall be published indicating the nature of the dispute and the terms of settlement, together with such explanations as may be appropriate. If the dispute has not been settled, a report by the council shall be published, setting forth with all necessary facts and explanations the recommendation which the council thinks just and proper for the settlement of the dispute. If the report is unanimously agreed to by the members of the council other than the parties to the dispute, the high contracting parties agree that they will not go to war with any party which complies with the recommendations, and that if any party shall refuse so to comply the council shall propose measures necessary to give effect to the reason. If no such unanimous report can be made, it shall be the duty of the majority and the privilege of the minority to issue statements indicating what they believe to be the facts and containing the reasons which they consider to be just and proper.

"The executive council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the body of delegates. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request must be made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute. In any case referred to the body of delegates all the provisions of this article and of article 12 relating to the action of the executive council shall apply to the action and powers of the body of delegates.

"ARTICLE 16.

"Should any of the high contracting parties break or disregard its covenants under article 12 it shall thereby ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not.

"It shall be the duty of the executive council in such cases to recommend what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

"The high contracting parties agree further that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which may be taken under this article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the high contracting parties who are cooperating to protect the covenants of the league.

"ARTICLE 17.

"In the event of disputes between one State member of the league and another State which is not a member of the league, or between States not members of the league, the high contracting parties agree that the State or States not members of the league shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the executive council may deem just, and upon acceptance of any such invitation the above provisions shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the league.

"Upon such invitation being given the executive council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances and merits of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

"In the event of a power so invited refusing to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, and taking any action against a State member of the league which in the case of a State member of the league would constitute a breach of article 12, the provisions of article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

"If both parties to the dispute, when so invited, refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, the executive council may take such action and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

"ARTICLE 18.

"The high contracting parties agree that the league shall be intrusted with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunitions with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary and in the common interest.

"ARTICLE 19.

"To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them, and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in the constitution of the league.

"The best method of giving practical effect of this principle is that the tutelage of such people should be intrusted to advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience, or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as mandatories on behalf of the league.

"The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions, and other similar circumstances.

"Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory power until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory power:

"Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory, subject to conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses, such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases, and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other members of the league.

"There are territories, such as southwest Africa and certain of the South Pacific isles, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centers of civilization, or their geographical continuity to the mandatory State, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the mandatory State as integral portions thereof, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of indigenous population.

"In every case of mandate the mandatory State shall render to the league an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

"The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory State shall, if not previously agreed upon by the high contracting parties in each case, be explicitly defined by the executive council in a special act or charter.

"The high contracting parties further agree to establish at the seat of the league a mandatory commission to receive and examine the annual reports of the mandatory powers, and to assist the league in insuring the observance of the terms of all mandates.

"ARTICLE 20.

"The high contracting parties will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extended; and to that end agree to establish as part of the organization of the league a permanent bureau of labor.

## "ARTICLE 21.

"The high contracting parties agree that provision shall be made through the instrumentality of the league to secure and maintain freedom of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all States members of the league, having in mind, among other things, special arrangements with regard to the necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918.

## "ARTICLE 22.

"The high contracting parties agree to place under the control of the league all international bureaus already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. Furthermore, they agree that all such international bureaus to be constituted in future shall be placed under the control of the league.

## "ARTICLE 23.

"The high contracting parties agree that every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any State member of the league shall be forthwith registered with the secretary general and as soon as possible published by him, and that no such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

## "ARTICLE 24.

"It shall be the right of the body of delegates from time to time to advise the reconsideration by State members of the league of treaties which have become inapplicable and of international conditions of which the continuance may endanger the peace of the world.

## "ARTICLE 25.

"The high contracting parties severally agree that the present covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations inter se which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly engage that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof. In case any of the powers signatories hereto or subsequently admitted to the league shall before becoming a party to this covenant have undertaken any obligations which are inconsistent with the terms of this covenant, it shall be the duty of such power to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

## "ARTICLE 26.

"Amendments to this covenant will take effect when ratified by the States whose representatives compose the executive council and by three-fourths of the States whose representatives compose the body of delegates."

"Mr. Chairman, I have the honor, and assume it a very great privilege, of reporting in the name of the commission constituted by this conference on the formulation of a plan for the league of nations. I am happy to say that it is a unanimous report, a unanimous report from the representatives of 14 nations—the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, and Serbia.

"I think it will be serviceable and interesting if I, with your permission, read the document as the only report we have to make."

[President Wilson then read the draft. When he reached article 15 and had read through the second paragraph, the President paused and said:]

"I pause to point out that a misconception might arise in connection with one of the sentences I have just read—'If any party shall refuse to comply, the council shall propose measures necessary to give effect to the recommendations.'"

## PRESENTS HYPOTHETICAL CASE.

"A case in point, a purely hypothetical case, is this: Suppose there is in the possession of a particular power a piece of territory or some other substantial thing in dispute, to which it is claimed that it is not entitled. Suppose that the matter is submitted to the executive council for recommendation as to the settlement of the dispute, diplomacy having failed, and suppose that the decision is in favor of the party which claims the subject matter of dispute as against the party which has the subject matter in dispute.

"Then, if the party in possession of the subject matter in dispute merely sits still and does nothing, it has accepted the decision of the council, in the sense that it makes no resistance, but something must be done to see that it surrenders the subject matter in dispute.

"In such a case, the only case contemplated, it is provided that the executive council may then consider what steps will be necessary to oblige the party against whom judgment has been given to comply with the decisions of the council."

[After having read article 19, President Wilson also stopped and said:]

"Let me say that before being embodied in this document this was the subject matter of a very careful discussion by representatives of the five greater parties, and that their unanimous conclusion is the matter embodied in this article."

## NO SERIOUS DIFFERENCE IN MOTIVE.

[After having read the entire document, President Wilson continued as follows:]

"It gives me pleasure to add to this formal reading of the result of our labors that the character of the discussion which occurred at the sittings of the commission was not only of the most constructive but of the most encouraging sort. It was obvious throughout our discussions that although there were subjects upon which there were individual differences of judgment with regard to the method by which our objects should be obtained there was practically at no point any serious differences of opinion or motive as to the objects which we were seeking.

"Indeed, while these debates were not made the opportunity for the expression of enthusiasm and sentiments, I think the other members of the commission will agree with me that there was an undertone of high respect and of enthusiasm for the thing we were trying to do which was heartening throughout everything.

"Because we felt that in a way this conference did entrust into us the expression of one of its highest and most important purposes, to see to it that the concord of the world in the future with regard to the objects of justice should not be subject to doubt or uncertainty; that the cooperation of the great body of nations should be assured in the maintenance of peace upon terms of honor and of international obligations.

"The compulsion of that task was constantly upon us, and at no point was there shown the slightest desire to do anything but suggest the best means to accomplish that great object. There is very great significance, therefore, in the fact that the result was reached unanimously.

"Fourteen nations were represented among them all of those powers which for convenience we have called the great powers, and among the rest a representation of the greatest variety of circumstances and interests. So that I think we are justified in saying that the significance of the result, therefore, has the deepest of all meanings, the union of wills in a common purpose, a union of wills which can not be resisted and which, I dare say, no nation will run the risk of attempting to resist.

## TERMS DOCUMENT SIMPLE.

"Now, as to the character of the document, while it has consumed some time to read this document, I think you will see at once that it is very simple, and in nothing so simple as in the structure which it suggests for a league of nations, a body of delegates, an executive council, and a permanent secretariat.

"When it came to the question of determining the character of the representation in the body of delegates we were all aware of a feeling which is current throughout the world.

"Inasmuch as I am stating it in the presence of the official representatives of the various governments here present, including myself, I may say that there is a universal feeling that the world can not rest satisfied with merely official guidance. There has reached us through many channels the feeling that if the deliberating body of the league of nations was merely to be a body of officials representing the various governments, the peoples of the world would not be sure that some of the mistakes which preoccupied officials had admittedly made might not be repeated.

## FOR VARIETY OF REPRESENTATION.

"It was impossible to conceive a method or an assembly so large and various as to be really representative of the great body of the peoples of the world, because, as I roughly reckon it, we represent as we sit around this table more than twelve hundred million people.

"You can not have a representative assembly of twelve hundred million people, but if you leave it to each government to have, if it pleases, one or two or three representatives, though only with a single vote, it may vary its representation from time to time, not only, but it may (originate) the choice of its several representatives [wireless here unintelligible].

"Therefore we thought that this was a proper and a very prudent concession to the practically universal opinion of plain men everywhere that they wanted the door left open to a variety of representation, instead of being confined to a single official body with which they could or might not find themselves in sympathy.

## UNLIMITED RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION.

"And you will notice that this body has unlimited rights of discussion. I mean of discussion of anything that falls within the field of international relations—and that it is especially agreed that war or international misunderstandings or any-



thing that may lead to friction or trouble is everybody's business, because it may affect the peace of the world.

"And in order to safeguard the popular power so far as we could of this representative body it is provided, you will notice, that when a subject is submitted it is not to arbitration but to discussion by the executive council; it can, upon the initiative of either of the parties to the dispute, be drawn out of the executive council on the larger form of the general body of delegates, because through this instrument we are depending primarily and chiefly upon one great force, and this is the moral force of the public opinion of the world—the pleasing and clarifying and compelling influences of publicity—so that intrigues can no longer have their covert, so that designs that are sinister can at any time be drawn into the open, so that those things that are destroyed by the light may be promptly destroyed by the overwhelming light of the universal expression of the condemnation of the world.

#### ARMED FORCE IN BACKGROUND.

"Armed force is in the background in this program, but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice the physical force of the world shall. But that is the last resort, because this is intended as a constitution of peace, not as a league of war.

#### DOCUMENT IS ADAPTABLE.

"The simplicity of the document seems to me to be one of its chief virtues, because, speaking for myself, I was unable to see the variety of circumstances with which this league would have to deal. I was unable, therefore, to plan all the machinery that might be necessary to meet the differing and unexpected contingencies. Therefore I should say of this document that it is not a strait-jacket but a vehicle of life.

"A living thing is born, and we must see to it what clothes we put on it. It is not a vehicle of power, but a vehicle in which power may be varied at the discretion of those who exercise it and in accordance with the changing circumstances of the time. And yet, while it is elastic, while it is general in its terms, it is definite in the one thing that we were called upon to make definite.

"It is a definite guaranty of peace. It is a definite guaranty by word against aggression. It is a definite guaranty against the things which have just come near bringing the whole structure of civilization into ruin.

#### PURPOSES NOT VAGUE.

"Its purposes do not for a moment lie vague. Its purposes are declared, and its powers are unmistakable. It is not in contemplation that this should be merely a league to secure the peace of the world. It is a league which can be used for co-operation in any international matter.

"That is the significance of the provision introduced concerning labor. There are many ameliorations of labor conditions which can be effected by conference and discussion. I anticipate that there will be a very great usefulness in the bureau of labor which it is contemplated shall be set up by the league.

"Men and women and children who work have been in the background through long ages and sometimes seemed to be forgotten, while governments have had their watchful and suspicious eyes upon the maneuvers of one another, while the thought of statesmen has been about structural action and the larger transactions of commerce and of finance.

#### LABOR AN INTERNATIONAL QUESTION.

"Now, if I may believe the picture which I see, there comes into the foreground the great body of the laboring people of the world, the men and women and children upon whom the great burden of sustaining the world must from day to day fall, whether we wish it to do so or not; people who go to bed tired and wake up without the stimulation of lively hope. These people will be drawn into the field of international consultation and help, and will be among the wards of the combined governments of the world. This is, I take leave to say, a very great step in advance in the mere conception of that.

"Then, as you will notice, there is an imperative article concerning the publicity of all international agreements. Henceforth no member of the league can call any agreement valid which it has not registered with the secretary general, in whose office, of course, it will be subject to the examination of any body representing a member of the league. And the duty is laid upon the secretary general to earliest possible time.

#### FOR PUBLICITY OF TREATIES.

"I suppose most persons who have not been conversant with the business of foreign affairs do not realize how many hundreds of these agreements are made in a single year, and how difficult it might be to publish the more unimportant of them immediately. How uninteresting it would be to most of the world to publish them immediately, but even they must be

published just as soon as it is possible for the secretary general to publish them.

"There has been no greater advance than this, gentlemen. If you look back upon the history of the world you will see how helpless peoples have too often been a prey to powers that had no conscience in the matter. It has been one of the many distressing revelations of recent years that the great power which has just been, happily, defeated put intolerable burdens and injustices upon the helpless people of some of the colonies which it annexed to itself, that its interest was rather their extermination than their development; that the desire was to possess their land for European purposes, and not to enjoy their confidence in order that mankind might be lifted in these places to the next higher level.

#### GERMANY TO LOSE COLONIES.

"Now, the world, expressing its conscience in law, says there is an end of that, that our consciences shall be settled to this thing. States will be picked out which have already shown that they can exercise a conscience in this matter, and under their tutelage the helpless peoples of the world will come into a new light and into a new hope."

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain resolutions adopted by the Shipbuilders' Federation of the Atlantic Coast, Gulf, and Great Lakes, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Shipbuilders' Federation of the Atlantic Coast, Gulf, and Great Lakes, held at Philadelphia, February 10, 11, 12, 13, 1918, representing the organized labor in all the shipbuilding and navy yards of the United States, with the exception of the Pacific coast.

*Resolved*, That it is the duty of the United States Government to protect the men employed in the navy yards and the shipyards of the United States, as well as the capital invested in the buildings, land, and machinery, and to that end they should see that in case any lay off is made in any shipyard or navy yard of the country that proper provision is made in advance for the transportation of the men to their homes and places in steady positions and to take the place of those which have been taken from them.

*Resolved*, That our country should develop its mercantile marine to the same extent as that of all of its great industries. It should be second to none in the world. We believe that American goods should be carried by American vessels and special attention should be given to developing our trade with every portion of the world. We therefore appeal to the President of the United States and to Congress to carry out the full program arranged during the war and to develop our mercantile marine to the fullest extent.

*Resolved*, That we believe that the American Navy should be equal to that of any other Navy in the world and that our country should not be obliged to rely upon any other power for our national defense, and with that end in view we heartily approve of the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy submitted to Congress, and most earnestly urge upon Congress to adopt the full program submitted by the Navy Department.

We regard the action of those Members of Congress who attacked the naval program for political purposes as antagonistic to the spirit of the American people. The citizens of our country are justly proud of the achievements of the Navy, which has reached its highest efficiency under the present administration. We also congratulate the present Secretary of the Navy for his management of the department, and which is the pride of our country to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. I present joint memorial No. 4 of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado and ask that the same be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 4, by Representatives Dolan, Owen, and Raye.]

To the Hon. WOODROW WILSON, President, and  
THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Your memorialist, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, now in session, respectfully represents that:

Whereas the conflict between democracy and autocracy has been brought to a successful termination through the most able assistance of our "Army of Liberty"; and

Whereas the demobilization of something like 2,000,000 men, of which number approximately 25,000 are Colorado's brave sons, who responded so nobly to the call of our country during the great crisis, is bound to have far-reaching results throughout the United States. Each city, every hamlet, and each community is bound to be more or less affected by the return to civil life and civil duties of these brave men, who sacrificed their all for the honor and liberty of the world; and

Whereas many of the enlisted men returning to the place of their enlistment are without a nickel in their pockets. (Reports of their plight are already floating back to disturb the equanimity of their former comrades.) How to obtain the ordinary comforts of life between the date of discharge and the next pay day is a problem so far left for the soldier himself and a few charitably disposed individuals to solve. The country is under a moral obligation to give its discharged soldiers an opportunity to return to civil life and civil duties in a manner that will not cause them to sacrifice their self-respect by becoming objects of charity, however willingly donated, for even the briefest time; and Whereas the soldiers are being mustered out on a few days' notice with no advance of pay, and in some instances without having received their pay for three and four months past services, and are turning up in the cities, improvident, "broke," away from home, without work,



applicants for civilian relief. Many of them do not want work yet. Many others are unwilling to undertake the day-labor jobs, which alone they can find. There is every prospect that unless remedial measures are promptly taken the sight of stranded, workless, moneyless soldiers will be common throughout the land;

Wherefore, your memorialist, the Twenty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, now in session, respectfully advises, recommends, and requests that your honorable body take such action as is necessary to provide for the payment to honorably discharged soldiers, at the time of their discharge, all pay due them at that time, and in addition, as a fitting testimonial of the sacrifice of these brave and noble men, six months' advance pay.

It is directed that this memorial be enrolled and that one copy be sent to the President of the United States, one to the President of the United States Senate, one to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one to the Secretary of War, one to the chairman on Military Affairs of the United States Senate, one to the chairman on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, and one to each of the Members representing the State of Colorado in the Senate and House of Representatives and in Congress now assembled;

And that the Twenty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, now in session, urgently requests our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their every effort and all honorable means to provide for the payment to honorably discharged soldiers all back pay due them and six months' advance pay upon their discharge from the Army, in conformity with the spirit and terms of this resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing House joint memorial has been duly adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado.

HARRY P. MASON,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a joint memorial telegraphed from the State senate of the Washington Legislature, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., February 14, 1919.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,  
Washington, D. C.:

Senate joint memorial 10.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Hon. WESLEY L. JONES has introduced in the Senate of the United States a resolution requesting the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to immediately remove the emergency restriction against the acceptance by American shipyards of foreign contracts for steel shipbuilding; and

Whereas the shipyards of the State of Washington are well equipped to accept and perform such contracts without prejudice to the interests of the United States; and

Whereas the obtaining of such contracts at this time will be of great advantage in assisting the industries of the State of Washington in the creating of industrial activity and in furnishing employment during the critical reconstruction period now confronting the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That your memorialists, the senate and-house of representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition your honorable body to recommend the immediate passage of such resolution and such other appropriate action as may be necessary to secure the removal of the restriction herein referred to; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this memorial be telegraphed to Edward M. Hurley, Chairman of the United States Shipping Board; to Charles Piez, Director General of the Fleet Corporation; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the President of the United States Senate; and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington.

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, February 13, 1919.

VICTOR ZEDNICK,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to say that I had a conference with Mr. Hurley this morning, and I think it is but fair to state that he is not very favorably inclined to this proposal, but that his reasons are not based upon diplomatic reasons, but upon his ideas as to the business situation. That is all I wish to say about it at this time.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask to have read a telegram from the Legislature of the State of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo., February 14, 1919.

Senator SELDEN P. SPENCER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Both house and senate adopted resolutions to-day calling on Missouri representatives to secure amendment to rivers and harbors bill, which appropriates only \$400,000 for the Missouri, when Congress voted in 1910 to expend \$2,000,000 a year for 10 years and has spent less than \$1,000,000 a year. Full resolution by mail.

W. G. KITCHEN, Chief Clerk.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairfield and Waterville, in the State of Maine, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 1029, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Rawlins, Wyo.,

and a petition of Local Lodge No. 757, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of St. James Council, No. 298, Knights of Columbus, of Boston, Mass., and a petition of the Robert Emmett Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Boston, Mass., praying for the freedom of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the executive committee of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the operation of the United States Employment Service after July 1, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to water-power legislation, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF TENNESSEE,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Ike B. Stevens, secretary of state of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 53, session 1919, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and by order of the governor affixed the great seal of the State of Tennessee at the department, in the city of Nashville, this 13th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

IKE B. STEVENS,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 53.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, IN SENATE,  
Nashville, February 11, 1919.

Whereas there is now being considered by a conference committee of Congress a bill entitled "An act to amend an act, entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of the dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of the interstate and foreign commerce," passed the Senate December 14, 1917, and the House of Representatives September 5, 1918; and

Whereas the water powers in the navigable rivers of the State of Tennessee and other Southern States are urgently needed for the industrial development and creation of new industries in the State of Tennessee and other Southern States:

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Tennessee especially urge its representatives in Congress and its representative on the water power bill conference committee to actively support and aid in every way that they possibly can the passage of water-power legislation at the present session of Congress and before adjournment; and

*Resolved further*, That the representatives in Congress from the State of Tennessee safeguard to the State all of its rights and privileges reserved to the State under its constitution in its navigable rivers, and that all charges, control, and administration of water powers developed in its navigable streams, except as to matters and questions that relate purely to navigation and interstate commerce, shall be left to be regulated by the laws of the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to each Member of the House of Representatives and each Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Adopted February 11, 1919.

ANDREW L. TODD,  
Speaker of the Senate.  
SETH M. WALKER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 13, 1919.

A. H. ROBERTS, Governor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also present a resolution adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of Johnson City, Tenn., stating that they are unalterably opposed to Government ownership of telephone properties and favoring the return of same to private operation, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regular meeting of the board of mayor and aldermen was held in the courtroom, Tuesday, February 4, 1919.

Present: Mayor C. P. Faw, Aldermen Ellison, Davis, McLeod, Taylor, and Sharp, City Manager Dyer, and Acting Recorder Artz.

Absent: Aldermen Thompson, Muse, and Richardson, City Attorney Barnes, and Recorder Warren.

The following proceedings were had, to wit:

Upon motion of Messrs. Ellison and Davis, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas Johnson City, Tenn., has for several years suffered the expense and inconvenience of two antiquated and inefficient telephone exchanges; and

"Whereas an earnest but unsuccessful effort has been made by the board of mayor and aldermen, since the Government assumed control over the telephone system of the country, to secure relief from said condition through the Postmaster General; and

"Whereas as in the case of railroads, the service rendered by said telephone exchanges has not only become more unsatisfactory but more expensive under Government control: Therefore be it



"Resolved by the board of mayor and aldermen, That they are unalterably opposed to Government ownership of telephone properties, but favor an early return of same to private operation, under proper Federal regulation: Be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Representative in Congress from the first district and to the two United States Senators from Tennessee."

Then the board adjourned.  
Adopted February 4, 1919.

C. P. FAW, Mayor.

Attest:

J. ALLEN ARTZ,  
Assistant Recorder.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a communication from the local board for Carroll County, Tenn., relative to the deportation of alien enemies, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNTINGDON, TENN., February 12, 1919.

Senator KENNETH D. McKELLAR,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since the war is now over and the period of reconstruction has begun, we trust Congress will not overlook the fact that there are many in our midst who were born in Germany and other foreign lands and had lived here many years prior to the war without ever having declared their intention to become citizens of our country. Some did declare themselves, but when it came to the protection of this great country that had nurtured and protected these ingrates they all claimed exemption from military service on the ground of noncitizenship. We believe that all such who are in our midst should be deported. For every alien so exempted a good American boy had to go to the front while they remained at home in ease and safety.

We appeal to you as Tennessee's representative in Congress, a State that has purer Anglo-Saxon population than any other State in the Union and who holds in her bosom as brave men and women as live on the earth anywhere, to see to it now, while we are going through this reconstruction, that not only the German cowards who surrendered their papers but the nondeclarants as well who claimed exemption on the ground of noncitizenship shall be sent where they belong—back to Germany or other former places of residence—for both of them are the same kind of parasites. A man not willing to fight certainly would not make a desirable citizen.

We believe in the "Put nobody on guard but Americans" plan, and we trust that as our representative at Washington you will support a measure restricting immigration in the future and that will make it impossible for the nondeclarant alien who claimed exemption from military service to be naturalized in the future.

We believe the time has come when a line should be drawn between patriots and traitors, and it should be done while things are fresh in our minds. We trust, therefore, that each Member of Congress from the "Volunteer State" will support a measure on the lines above suggested, and, if necessary, that some of our Members may introduce such a measure.

Yours, respectfully,

LOCAL BOARD FOR CARROLL COUNTY,  
J. B. COX, Chairman.  
J. SAM JOHNSON.  
W. H. EASON.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also present a communication from the Ministerial Alliance of Nashville, Tenn., concerning Christian unity and a league of nations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION CONCERNING CHRISTIAN UNITY AND A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.  
I. CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The Ministerial Alliance of Nashville, Tenn., composed of Protestant ministers of the city, recognizing the gracious Providence which has given victory to the allied armies that have been fighting for the suppression of crime and violence and for the establishment of righteousness and peace in the earth, desire to give expression of their gratitude to Almighty God for the blessings wherewith He has blessed us and our allies in this struggle of might against right. We desire to give renewed expression to our faith in the adaptation of Christianity to the world's moral and spiritual needs and in the ultimate spread and triumph among men and among all nations of the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, which alone has power to banish war from the earth and to give ultimate and permanent peace to the world. But to accomplish this beneficent and far-reaching result it is absolutely necessary at this time to internationalize all Christians if we are to Christianize all nations. The time has come when the followers of Christ everywhere are called on as perhaps never before to cultivate the spirit of unity and cooperation in their great and common task. For the accomplishment of the task to which this generation is called, and for which the opportune day has come, we need to reconsecrate ourselves as Christians not only to ceaseless prayers, but to sacrificial and undivided service for humanity, a service of unified effort so important and imperative at this epoch and crisis in the world's history that it will be nothing less than a moral crime for it to be marred or defeated by sectarian rivalries and jealousies. (A league of the nations of the world, if it is to be on the basis of the ethical ideals of Christianity, which is the only basis upon which it can be effected, should be preceded and accompanied by such a union or league of Christians of all names and creeds as will bring upon the nations of the earth the impact of a world-wide Christian church unified in brotherly love and cooperative service.) The call of the Master of mankind that comes to his followers to-day is to put the emphasis of our faith and preaching and practice upon their unities and not upon their differences. Let this spirit of brotherly love and cooperation be all along the far-flung battle lines of world conquest for Christ, the inspiration and the passion of the new Christian patriotism that will be no less national because it has become international.

#### II. A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

This ministerial alliance also desires to give its indorsement to the movement looking to a league of all nations for the promotion of world-wide and permanent peace; and without as yet indorsing any one of

the different theories or plans suggested for the organization and maintenance of such a league, as opposed to other theories and plans, we give it as our deep conviction that some such union of nations as that proposed is the wisest, if, indeed, it be not the only, method of effectually preventing war in the future and of promoting that spirit of brotherhood among nations such as can alone be the guarantee of permanence for the league if it should be organized.

To President Woodrow Wilson and to all other statesmen of the world, to whatsoever nationality they may belong, who are seriously and unselfishly endeavoring to establish on the basis of Christian ideals of justice, of liberty, and of human brotherhood such a league as that proposed, we pledge our devout and unceasing prayers to the God and Father of all men and all nations that he would divinely guide those who are working to bring about this fellowship of nations in a league of peace and crown their deliberations and efforts with such success as shall make it a supreme blessing to the whole world.

W. F. TILLET.

Mr. KING. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint memorial (H. J. M. 2) memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of an amendment to the bill introduced by Senator BANKHEAD in the United States Senate on December 4, 1918, known as S. 5088; also the same amendment to a bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator SWANSON on December 5, 1918, known as S. 5098; also the same amendment to a bill introduced by Mr. SHACKLEFORD in the House of Representatives of the United States on December 12, 1918, known as H. R. 13354; and also to any other similar bills introduced in Congress in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid.

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there are pending in the Congress of the United States bills known as S. 5088 and S. 5098 and H. R. 13354, all of which provide for additional Federal aid for post roads under the terms of the act of Congress approved July 11, 1916, and commonly known as the Federal aid road act; and

Whereas section 6 of said Federal aid road act provides that the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and

Whereas, although additional Federal aid for road building at the present time is highly desirable, nevertheless those States having large areas and relatively small populations will be unable to avail themselves of the benefits of this act as amended to provide additional Federal aid without a disproportionate burden of taxation;

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the said bills, and any other similar bills which may be introduced in the Congress of the United States, be so amended that section 6 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that in those States where the average population per square mile of area is 100 persons or more, based upon the census of 1910, the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and that in those States where the average population per square mile of area, based on the census of 1910, is less than 100 persons, the share of the United States shall be increased one-fourth of 1 per cent for each person, or major fraction thereof, less than 100 per square mile; and, furthermore,

Whereas section 3 of said Federal aid road act provides that so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State only until the close of the succeeding fiscal year; and

Whereas on account of the said provision of section 3 of said act, local conditions existing in some States render it practically impossible to comply with the terms of the act:

Now, therefore, your memorialists also request that said bills now pending in Congress, and any other similar bills which may be introduced, be amended so that section 3 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that so much of the appropriation to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State until the close of the second succeeding fiscal year; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the Members of the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

The foregoing H. J. M. 2 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the president of the senate, in the presence of the house over which he presides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the Journal this 5th day of February, 1919.

G. H. DEER,  
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Attest:

ADAM L. PETERSEN,  
Secretary of Senate.

The foregoing H. J. M. 2 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the speaker of the house, in the presence of the house over which he presides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the Journal this 4th day of February, 1919.

CHARLES C. RICHARDS,  
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

HUGO B. ANDERSON,  
Chief Clerk of House.

Received from the house of representatives this 6th day of February, 1919.

Approved, February 6, 1919.

SIMON BAMBERGER,  
Governor.

Received from the governor and filed in the office of the secretary of state this 6th day of February, 1919.

HARDEN BENNION,  
Secretary of State,  
By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

STATE OF UTAH,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing Congress for the passage of an amendment to bills now pending before said body to provide for a more equitable application for Federal aid for post roads, etc., as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 6th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,  
Secretary of State.  
By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

Mr. KING presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salt Lake City, Sandy, Midvale, Murray, and Magna, all in the State of Utah, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ROANOKE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 5580) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Martin and Bertie, in the State of North Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Roanoke River at or near Williamston, N. C., and I submit a report (No. 722) thereon.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TUG RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 5478) granting the consent of Congress to the Fall Branch Coal Co. to construct a bridge across Tug River, and I submit a report (No. 723) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5610) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to negotiate and arrange with certain foreign Governments to convert their present indebtedness to the United States into marketable and saleable securities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 5611) granting to certain claimants a preference right to purchase public lands in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5612) to create the Yakima National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5613) to donate a captured German machine gun to the town of Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 5614) to create a Federal industrial relations commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5615) to authorize the President of the United States to restore Milo O. Frank and William H. Fort first lieutenants in the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5616) for the promotion and retirement of Lieut. Col. Samuel R. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLICITY OF STOCK SALES.

Mr. SIMMONS. I introduce a bill sent to me by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is a bill to provide for furnishing information with respect to shares of stock offered to the public, and prescribing penalties. I introduce it at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 5617) to provide for furnishing information with respect to shares of stock offered to the public and prescribing penalties was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine,

and pay the amounts due in all claims for damages (other than such as are occasioned by vessels of the Navy) to and loss of privately owned property, occurring subsequent to April 6, 1917, where the amount of the claim does not exceed \$500, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the active list as extra numbers and next below their running mates in the regular naval service such officers of the Naval Reserve Force, not exceeding 50 in number, who have served in the Navy during both the Spanish War and the war against Germany and her allies, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the United States Naval Reserve Force intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that any retired officer of the Navy or Marine Corps who has creditably performed active duty for a period of not less than one year and a half during the war with Germany shall be promoted on the retired list with the next higher rank, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing that any retired officer of the Navy or Marine Corps who has been or shall be detailed to active duty shall receive the rank, pay, and allowance of the grade not above that of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LENROOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 for the construction of a road through the village of Odanah in the Bad River Reservation, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES IN HONOR OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to submit a concurrent resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration. I will say that it conforms to the usual form of printing the memorial exercises in honor of a deceased Senator or Representative.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there shall be printed and bound, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 14,100 copies of the proceedings and the eulogies delivered in Congress on Theodore Roosevelt, late a President of the United States, with illustration, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 8,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senators and Representatives of the State of New York, and 100 copies, bound in full morocco, for the use of Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt: *Provided*, That there shall be included in such document the proclamation of the President and the proceedings in the Supreme Court of the United States on the death of Mr. Roosevelt, an account of the funeral services, and other matters as may be deemed appropriate.

INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 454), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Armenian nation has for many centuries occupied certain regions in Asia Minor, extending from Arrarat to the Gulf of Alexandria, including the southern littoral of the Black Sea, in the region of Trebizond; and

Whereas the Armenian nation is the oldest nation inhabiting said regions, and has developed therein a national culture with a common language and religion; and

Whereas the Armenians are capable of self-government, and their common interests and aspirations make proper the erection of a national Armenian Government in said region: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that Armenia be constituted a free and independent country, and that the Armenian people be permitted to erect therein a free national republic for the maintenance of their national rights and the perpetuation of their native language, culture, and traditions.

INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 455), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas people of the Greek race have from time immemorial occupied the lands in Europe and Asia Minor bordering upon the Aegean Sea and have also occupied the islands of said sea; and

Whereas the political independence and the culture of the Greeks were for many centuries submerged by the intrusion of the Ottoman Turks into said lands and their despotic domination of the same; and



Whereas the present Kingdom of Greece was the first country in said region to be liberated from Turkish rule, and since its establishment has consistently striven for the liberation of the people of Greek nationality, who reside in Epirus, Southern Albania, Thrace, and Anatolia; and

Whereas the Greek nation has been loyal to the cause of the allied nations in the war against the central empires and has rendered valuable military assistance and made other contributions to the success of the allies in their campaign in the Balkans, notwithstanding the pro-German policy and attitude of the former Greek King: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the territory of the Kingdom of Greece be extended to include Epirus, Southern Albania, Thrace, the islands of the Aegean Sea, and those parts of Anatolia the inhabitants of which are of Greek nationality.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15706. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I feel obliged to attend a very important meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs this morning, and I shall, therefore, occupy the time of the Senate for just a moment to conclude the remarks which I was making when the Senate took a recess yesterday afternoon.

At that time I was calling attention to some specific items in the pending bill, among which was that found on page 5, appropriating \$3,000,000 for the purpose, among other things, of acquiring the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. I made some statements with regard to that project which have been challenged by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], whose familiarity with the history of the project is very great and far more accurate, both as to conclusion and detail, than mine. I shall not challenge any of the statements which he has made, for I have not had time to examine them and because I know that he would not have made them if they were not based upon facts. But I may say, Mr. President, that this is an old project, one which has been before Congress for a good many years and which is now in the conclusive stages of what may be called a successful result.

This canal is desired, among other things, for naval and strategic purposes. The Senator from Delaware, I think, referred to a document which emanates from the War Department and refers to the use of this canal for the transfer, in case of emergency or when desired, of our fleet from one point to the other, without subjecting itself to the danger of attack on the sea.

The modern battleship, Mr. President, requires a draft of from 25 to 30 feet of water, and this canal has but 9 feet; the modern superdreadnaught requires a width for safe passage through a canal very much more than the width of this canal now is. All of which means, Mr. President, that the acquisition of this canal is merely the initial step in a series of tremendous appropriations for its enlargement, and until so enlarged the canal can not be utilized for the purposes mentioned. Of course, I realize that the canal can be used in a small way for the passage from the Delaware into the Chesapeake Bay of craft engaged in commerce. That, however, I do not understand is anything more than an incident to the acquisition of this canal.

Mr. President, if we have waited so many years for the final acquisition of this canal, I submit that in these days of peace, while negotiating a league of nations that shall make wars and the rumors of wars impossible, at a time when the Nation, having just emerged from the bloodiest of all conflicts, is sympathetic with any movement having for its purpose the permanent banishment of war from the face of the earth, and having in mind the enormous expense of that war and the enormous appropriations which we are now making, it might wait for a few years before \$3,000,000 of the people's money are appropriated for its acquisition.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado object to my interrupting him as he goes along with respect to the particular point he desires to make?

Mr. THOMAS. I would not object to it, except that I want to get through as soon as possible. Of course, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. For example, I desire to say that the reason the canal has not been in operation during the past war and of very great use is the opposition of the character which is presented by the Senator from Colorado to-day. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the earnest manner in which I have

advocated the purchase and deepening of this canal for the last five or six years—

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. SAULSBURY. To illustrate, when you start an effort of this sort in time of peace, the reply is that we are never going to have any war, and when we are done with the war that we are never going to have any other war.

I will say to the Senator, for example, that during the last war, in the U-boat raid on the Atlantic seaboard just 3 miles off Delaware capes, probably enough ships were torpedoed and sunk and cargoes destroyed to have paid for the whole building of this canal. Those ships would undoubtedly have passed through this canal had it been constructed. I merely use that as an illustration. The Senator is mistaken in regard to the sole purpose of this canal, or the greatest purpose, being naval or military, although that would be very great.

I have here a statement of Admiral Benson, the head of our Navy, showing before the war the immense importance of it, and its great commercial use is testified to by a report from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I know that there was large destruction of sea craft during the spring and summer of last year, but I very much doubt if even 50 per cent of the vessels destroyed would ever have passed through this canal if it had been in existence. They were boats engaged in the West Indian traffic and the South American traffic, and some of them, of course, were coastwise vessels.

Frankly, I am opposed, either in time of peace or in time of war, to the expenditure of the people's money for such purposes. I think I ought to say that. My suggestion that the appropriation should not be made now is by no means a concession upon my part that it ought to be made at all. I know the Senator from Delaware feels differently from myself regarding the subject. I know he feels, and feels with all the ardency of his nature, that the acquisition of this canal is essential to the commercial and military needs of the country. I do not think so. So far as the commercial needs are concerned, the canal, if it is not desired to be sold by the stockholders because of its profitable character, there is no reason why the Government should interest itself in the subject by taking it off their hands.

Now, I confess I am no expert; I may be entirely wrong; but my judgment is that the aircraft of the future will be the great arm of offense and defense of the Nation, not only on the sea-coast but on the sea and on the land; that it will ultimately attain that position through its development, which is now coming very fast, and which I think the Government should recognize and encourage as vigorously as possible. The battleship itself will be as obsolete in 20 years as the old three-masted frigate of war of pre-Civil War days now is. That, however, is merely conjecture.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Might I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to show to the Senator how this matter has been considered. On last evening I handed to the Senator the report made by the War Department—the Chief of Staff and the War College—in regard to the utility of this canal, and I am almost sure from my recollection that it shows how a descent would probably be made at the capes of the Delaware and a lodgment effected by any great naval power that could overcome our high-seas fleet. That joins in precisely with the idea which the Senator has now expressed in regard to the efficiency of aircraft. A lodgment being made at the port of Lewes, which is the only fine undefended harbor on the Atlantic seaboard between New York and Norfolk, that lodgment could be made an aviation base, from which this city could be attacked in one hour by aircraft, Philadelphia in less than an hour, and New York in a little more than an hour in the way that aircraft go now. The result of it might be that this lodgment would be effected because our Navy could not be concentrated there for the purpose of preventing it, and we would be subjected to some of the horrors which have occurred in Belgium simply because our Navy could not prevent that lodgment, which they could do if the ships lying in New York Harbor and at Hampton Roads were able to prevent a landing being made. I only cite that to illustrate how all this defense work comes from that careful consideration which I know the learned Senator, whose great ability is known to us all, would give to a law case were he considering it before he went into court.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. President, the Senator's statement proves too much. If foreign countries are developing aircraft to the extent that would make possible such a calamity as has been outlined, then all the naval safeguards against



such a calamity would be utterly inadequate to prevent it, because we know now that by building platforms upon the turrets containing the great guns of the modern superdreadnaught aircraft are carried in great numbers, relatively speaking, and can be launched from those bases and accomplish the identical things to which the Senator refers, unless our own aircraft development is sufficiently comprehensive to overcome it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not wish the Senator to understand me as saying that aircraft could effect a lodgment such as I have described. I said that naval vessels, our high-seas fleet being defeated, could effect such a lodgment and use it as a base.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I understand the Senator. I am not afraid of any lodgment being made on the coast of the United States by any naval force in existence. In these days of submarines, mines, depth bombs, and huge coast guns, I undertake to say that the entire British Navy, in the event of an unfortunate conflict between that great power and ourselves, could only penetrate the confines of this country by coming by way of Canada, which, of course, we could not prevent under any circumstances. One of the significant features of this war has been the inability of any fleet, however powerful, to effect a landing or a lodgment on hostile territory, with the single exception of the unfortunate expedition at Gallipoli, and there the landing was made difficult, of course, but it was nevertheless made, because of the absence of those very elements of defense to which I have called attention.

Mr. SMOOT. And it proved a very expensive undertaking.

Mr. THOMAS. And the expense of it, both in blood and in treasure, was simply appalling. The day has passed when any naval force can effect a lodgment on the shores of any country that is properly defended by modern appliances.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not quite understand how naval vessels are going to be benefited by the purchase of this canal and the dredging of it to a depth of 12 feet.

Mr. THOMAS. Thirty-five feet, if necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the report, which says:

Regarding the further improvement of the already recommended waterway between Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay, the Chief of Engineers concurs with both the special board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the opinion that it is advisable for the United States to buy the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at a cost to the United States not exceeding \$2,514,290, and to then enlarge it to a sea-level canal of 12 feet depth and 90 feet bottom width, with the least interference practicable to existing traffic, following in general the methods indicated by the special board, at a cost which, including the first year's maintenance, amounts in round numbers to \$8,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 should be made available by the first appropriation, and economical work will then require subsequent appropriations of from \$500,000 to a million dollars per year.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me, I think I can possibly enlighten the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Of course the statement of the Senator from Utah, which he reads from simply one of the reports, of which there are a multitude, shows that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." There is no doubt in my mind that the purchase of this canal will lead ultimately to its deepening sufficiently to permit the passage of our naval vessels through it. That is what the naval experts recommend. I hold in my hand, for example, a monograph by Admiral Benson on this question, from which I can read to the Senator what his views are, if the Senator would care to hear them, but the information on this very subject, to be found in the reports made from time to time by commercial bodies, by naval commissions, by military commissions, and by the commercial experts of the Commerce Department, is so voluminous that in order to bring it before the Senate it would take too much time, but I can refer the Senator to all those reports.

My hope is—and I state it frankly—that the purchase and deepening of this canal will so demonstrate the great utility of that kind of transportation commercially, will so show how the power of our fleet can be greatly increased—and Admiral Mahan is one of the great authorities on that subject from whom I have freely quoted in some of the efforts I have made in regard to it—that it will result finally in the construction of a Philadelphia-New York canal, we will call it, which will many times multiply the efficiency of our fleet. While, of course, a 12-foot depth would only accommodate light-draft vessels—and that would be a very great thing commercially—I have no idea that this canal when purchased will be limited to 12 feet. I think its utility, as suggested in that report, will be so demonstrated

that the Federal Government will continue to deepen and widen the canal until it is really made an effective waterway.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Delaware has made that statement. I think the Senate ought to know approximately what the expenditure will be upon this canal to make it 35 feet deep, according to the engineers' report.

Mr. RANSDELL. If I may interrupt the Senator, he said to "35 feet"; I presume he means 25 feet.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator from Delaware said "35 feet."

Mr. SAULSBURY. Twenty-five feet is the extent to which they have gone in making these estimates, and that depth will probably accommodate all except the superdreadnaughts of our Navy. I can tell the Senator, in round numbers, exactly what the cost of such a canal will be; it will be about \$12,000,000 altogether.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not figure it in that way if this report is true. The report says that if it is made a sea-level canal of 12 feet depth and 90 feet bottom width it will cost \$8,000,000. I understand that the canal to-day is about 9 feet deep.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It has a depth of 9 feet; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. It has a depth of 9 feet, and 12 feet will make 3 feet extra. Now, if the 3 feet extra cost \$8,000,000, then if the canal were deepened to 35 feet, deducting 9 feet, the present depth, from 35 feet, would leave 26 feet, and 3 into 26 goes nearly nine times, and nine times \$8,000,000 is \$72,000,000, which would be the cost to make it 35 feet deep; and the Senator knows that the deeper the canal is dredged the more costly it is.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the figuring of the Senator shows that anything can be done by a man with a lead pencil, and that my statement in the first place, that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing," is absolutely true. I will explain to the Senator just why his calculations are all wrong. It is because of facts with which the Senator is not familiar.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator—

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will permit me just a moment—

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to say to the Senator that I simply base my figures upon this report. If the report is wrong, then, of course, my figures are wrong.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The report is not wrong.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, does the Senator admit, then, that to deepen this canal to 12 feet from 9 feet and make a bottom width of 90 feet will cost \$8,000,000?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think probably the engineers are accurate in that estimate.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I want to say to the Senator that would indicate that for every 3 feet of additional depth it will cost \$8,000,000.

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; I will explain that to the Senator, if he will permit me.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, if there is a way of explaining it, I should like to have the explanation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can explain it, I think, to the satisfaction of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I will be glad to hear the Senator's explanation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the present canal is a lock canal. That includes the purchase price of the canal at \$2,500,000. The upper levels of the lock canal must be cut down until they are 12 feet below ordinary sea level; so that the greatest cost will be the first cutting, where you have to go down, for example, in the upper levels, 22 feet in order to get your 12 feet. Thereafter the dredging is not, as the Senator supposes, much more expensive, but the water-borne dredges can, of course, excavate up to a reasonable depth much more cheaply the greater amount they excavate at one place and the better transportation they have; so that these figures have all been estimated and given in the reports of the engineers, and I can refer the Senator to the engineers' estimates, for a width of 125 feet and 25 feet deep. That would be sufficient to demonstrate absolutely the utility and usefulness of this canal, and would pass a very great many of our naval vessels, all of our submarines, all of our tenders, and answer for ordinary commercial purposes. The cost, including the purchase of this canal, widened to 125 feet and to a sea-level depth of 25 feet, is given on page 10 of Document 196, referred to, and is stated to be \$12,424,500. I will say to the Senator that I am practically certain that that will be reduced half a million dollars on account of conditions that exist regarding land purchases and things of that kind, which are estimated at a very high rate; but I hope I have explained to the Senator how the first cutting is the most expensive.



Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the very document from which he is reading; and this is what I find:

If the lock canal is ever to be deepened to 25 feet, it would be advantageous to so arrange its foundations, sills, and floors as to allow of such deepening without serious extra cost or serious interference with traffic, and this will add also somewhat to cost of construction. Making an allowance for these items, and stating the special board's estimates in round numbers, its estimates will stand as follows:

Lock canal, 12-foot depth, cost \$20,000,000.

Lock canal, 25-foot depth, cost \$30,000,000.

Sea-level canal, 12-foot depth—

And that is what we are undertaking to arrive at—

\$33,000,000.

Sea-level canal, 25-foot depth, \$45,000,000.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Where does the Senator get those figures?

Mr. SMOOT. On page 7 of the report of the office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, dated Washington, August 9, 1913, addressed to the Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SAULSBURY. But the Senator is referring to the wrong canal. The Senator is referring to a canal in another portion of the Atlantic seaboard. He is referring now, if the Senator will permit me, to the canal across New Jersey, which is not even started yet.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it says here, beginning with paragraph 3:

Regarding the further improvement of the already recommended waterway between Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay, the Chief of Engineers concurs with both the special board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the opinion that it is advisable for the United States to buy the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, at a cost to the United States of not exceeding \$2,514,290, and to then enlarge it to a sea-level canal of 12 feet depth and 90 feet bottom width, with the least interference practicable to existing traffic, following, in general, the methods indicated by the special board, at a cost which, including the first year's maintenance, amounts in round numbers to \$8,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 should be made available by the first appropriation, and economical work will then require subsequent appropriations of from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 per year.

Then paragraph 4 says:

The Chief of Engineers concurs with the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the view that further deepening to 25 feet of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at an extra cost of \$4,500,000 should await further observation—

Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes; but, Mr. President, the Senator from Utah simply skipped paragraph 5. Paragraphs 3 and 4 refer to the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. Paragraph 5 goes on to say:

Regarding the proposed waterway from Delaware River to New York Bay, the Chief of Engineers concurs—

And so forth. Paragraph 6 proceeds to consider the New York Canal; and the figures from which the Senator reads are in paragraph 6, which refers to the building of the New York Canal, which, of course, will take a vastly greater amount of money and will probably take \$45,000,000. I hope the Senator sees that he is reading from the wrong page.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was only reading the report, and I have not had time to study it, because it was handed to me by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] just a few moments ago.

Mr. SAULSBURY. But not in regard to this canal.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, it has reference to the canal.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SAULSBURY. That is precisely what I have been going through for five years here—trying to get my colleagues to understand that we are talking about one thing which has been thoroughly estimated, and they bring in inadvertently, unknowingly, figures which refer to entirely different things. I have been managing to educate about one Senator a year on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, since the name of the Senator from Louisiana has been mentioned—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield for just a moment.

Mr. RANDELL. I simply want to say that I was very glad to hand to the Senator from Utah the report to which he has been referring, which covers two or three sections. He inadvertently had the section between New York Bay and the Delaware River confused with the section between the Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay. It was just a little and very natural error on his part.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in a matter of this kind what are a few millions between friends? The fact is that Uncle Sam's Treasury will be burdened to some degree, expressed in seven figures or probably eight figures, whether the enterprise

is as contended by the Senator from Delaware or as urged by the Senator from Utah. The probabilities are, and I think the history of our river and harbor appropriations sustains the inference, that whatever the estimates may be the ultimate cost to the Treasury will greatly exceed them.

Mr. President, I am not going to dwell longer upon this subject. I have said perhaps more than I ought to have said, and the discussion has been more illuminating by those who have interrupted than by myself. But before I take my seat, Mr. President, I want to register a protest, as solemnly as I can, against the devotion of the few remaining days of the Sixty-fifth Congress to the consideration of business like the river and harbor bill. We have about 14 days left for actual work; and the business upon the calendar of the most tremendous and pressing importance is, in my judgment, altogether beyond the possibility of intelligent disposal if we should devote every minute of every hour of every day to its consideration up to the 4th of March next at 12 o'clock noon. We have spent two or three days upon this bill, and it will doubtless consume as many more—valuable days, precious days—when the great department supply bills, the great appropriation bills necessary to operate this Government for the next fiscal year, are thrust aside, to say nothing of a number of conference reports which refer to matters of equal importance.

In addition, Mr. President, this Congress ought to—although I do not believe it can—enact some legislation before it adjourns for the purpose of repressing the seditious and insurrectionary conditions that are becoming more and more menacing in the great centers of the country every day. We are fiddling our time away when the Nation seems to be in the very throes of a coming volcanic upheaval, and we are doing nothing about it except determining how much money we can obtain for this scheme and for that and the other out of the Treasury of the United States.

One of the most ominous articles I have read in many days appears in this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled "Reds' Beyond Reach," and it is from the pen of George Rothwell Brown. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read this article. I hope every man and every woman within the sound of my voice will read it, because it will convey to them some degree of knowledge of the manner in which the devotees of the red flag of anarchy have conducted themselves since the armistice was signed and the surveillance of the Government upon their activities relaxed. It appears that in two of the great cities of the Union there are scores of publications that have sprung up like mushrooms, printed on red paper or in red ink, and reaching from 500,000 to 5,000,000 of the people daily, not only encouraging but advising insurrection, not only suggesting but preaching the doctrine of the dagger and the torch, and announcing that when the hour arrives—and it will arrive soon—universal massacre and destruction of all except the criminals composing these organizations will begin. In other words, these publications advocate and practice treason against the Government of the United States and the State governments, and are doing it with impunity, conscious of the relaxation of existing laws which in themselves were in many directions too weak to meet the emergencies confronting the officers of the Government.

We should make treason odious in this country by appropriate legislation—by summary legislation. If necessary, we should sweep aside everything upon the calendar and enact such legislation now, because self-preservation is the first law of nature. We are minimizing the magnitude of these conditions, as Americans are always apt to do until the crisis shall have been reached and possibly passed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator is aware, doubtless, that there is a nation-wide propaganda for the repeal of the espionage law, and for the purpose of permitting the United States mails to be made the vehicle of carrying the very literature of which the Senator speaks, which advocates assassination, murder, revolution, and the destruction of our form of government.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes, Mr. President. It is being done openly; and why should it not be done openly, when the officials of the Government must be supine for lack of legislative authority to proceed? I suppose the widening of Podunk Creek, or \$1,000,000 to the Kinnikinnick River, or \$5,000,000 for the purchase of a canal, is so supremely important that we have not time to consider, much less to discuss, this menace. We prefer to divide the raiment of the Republic in the shadow of the cross rather than take up the problem of meeting this menace and the enacting of legislation that will at least place upon the authorities the responsibility of seeing to it that government of the people shall not perish from the earth.



Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that if this bill is to be passed we shall pass it, and take up this more important subject, and do something about it before Congress adjourns.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think no one can controvert the very impressive statement that has just been made by the Senator from Colorado. I doubt if many Senators even understand the widespread propaganda which is going on in the United States to-day, not only through the press, to which the Senator has referred, but in innumerable meetings where treason is being taught and talked without remonstrance on the part of the Government. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and the people of this country will have to give some consideration to their own self-preservation.

However important the duties of the President may be on the other side—and I do not intend to discuss that matter, because there is a difference of opinion—I say that he can not perform a more important duty than taking the lead in the matter to which the Senator from Colorado has referred, and stamping out in some form this wicked propaganda which is going on in the United States. If the occupant of the chair in this Chamber were exercising the duties of the President of the United States I know what would be done, I think. I think some action would be taken by Congress which would at least check this evil, which is likely to be a scourge within the immediate future.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss that particular question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Colorado suggested that Congress should either set aside the bill we now have or pass it promptly and proceed to consider this matter. I think I appreciate the importance of the statement he made and the subject he referred to, but I wanted to ask him, and as he has been called out I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts, whether he knows if any administrative officer of the Government has submitted any proposal to Congress that would meet the situation, or has any committee of Congress reported any legislation that Congress could proceed to consider to meet the situation?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I have not any information that would enable me to answer that question in the affirmative, but what Congress needs and what the country needs is a leader in this matter. We are going to waste our effort unless we have some determining factor to point out the way which we should go, and under the conditions which obtain to-day we have not any such leader.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator know of anyone who ought to be better able to direct us as to how to proceed than the administrative officers of the Government?

Mr. WEEKS. Of course, they should be the motive force in whatever action is taken, and Congress will very readily follow.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest to the Senator that there is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigating that subject now.

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, but, Mr. President, that subcommittee has been in active operation for weeks—I do not know but as long as two months—and the Senator from Florida knows very well that there is not a Senator in this Chamber who has time to read one-tenth of the testimony which they have taken. They are not likely to report within a definite time, and if we wait for a report from that investigation we are going to be deluged with this question, and, I am afraid, in a bloody way.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is right in referring to the subcommittee to which the Senator from Florida referred. The duties of that committee are limited and do not involve any recommendation for legislation. They were merely to investigate a charge that was made in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with respect to the use of money to carry on a propaganda in favor of the brewers. Then, the scope of the committee was enlarged to ascertain if there was any German propaganda in this country; and lastly, by an amendment, or another resolution, rather, which was offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] a few days ago, the subcommittee was directed to inquire what activities were going on in this country by the Bolsheviks, whether there was any money being expended for the purpose of disseminating Bolshevik sentiments in this country. But I do not understand that that committee is authorized to formulate any legislation or to report any particular legislation.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from Utah knows perfectly well that it will not formulate, in the immediate future at least, any

effective legislation which is to deal with this question as it should be dealt with.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator states the matter accurately and I regret—

Mr. WEEKS. And I am not disparaging the subcommittee in the least.

Mr. KING. I know the Senator is not; I happen to be a member of this subcommittee. I know the Senator has no intention of doing that, but I regret that there is no committee now working upon the question, which committee would be ready to submit at an early date concrete recommendation to deal with the question to which the Senator from Colorado referred.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that an inquiry ought to be made as to whether any money was spent in the interest of this propaganda prompts me to say that it is not necessary to spend money to start such a propaganda. The maladministration of justice and unfair dealings with patriotic men arouses a feeling of antagonism which ultimately makes alliances with any who favor a kindlier and better disposition toward the average citizen.

We were discussing here the other day with a great deal of vigor the court-martial revelations before the Committee on Military Affairs. Such revelations are calculated to bring into disrepute the officers and offices of the Government.

This morning I am informed that under the direction of the Department of Justice soldiers returning from abroad are being arrested in the city of Detroit for wearing their uniforms one day after they have returned, and an appeal made to the War Department says the War Department has nothing to do with the matter. They take one view and the Department of Justice takes another, the Department of Justice construing the law as they think it should be construed, which it is not too much to say is in direct opposition to the construction of the law which is placed upon it by the War Department. Oh, Mr. President, has it come to pass that a soldier who has honored his uniform by fighting the battles of his country can not wear that uniform home with him?

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator say that has occurred or that he has read of it? It seems incredible.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have it upon authority very direct that there is an absolute conflict between the Department of Justice and the War Department upon the right of the soldier to wear his uniform after reaching his home. He may wear his uniform under the law from the scene of his military activities to his home not exceeding the period of 90 days. The War Department holds that he has a right to wear his uniform 90 days even around home, and the Department of Justice is hunting down these soldiers and prosecuting them and placing them under arrest for doing so. I am informed this was done only yesterday in the city of Detroit.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I ask the Senator if they are being prosecuted for wearing their uniforms after the 90 days or during the 90 days?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One day after their discharge and return to their homes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. One day after their discharge?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and his return to his home; the uniform that the soldier has honored while imperiling his life perhaps.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am asking for information. I have had a great many inquiries about it, and my understanding was that they were permitted to wear their uniforms by the War Department for three or four weeks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The War Department takes that view, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, but the Department of Justice takes a directly opposite view, and in the enforcement of the law the Department of Justice has a wider and more important function than the War Department.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want to pursue the matter any further. I am humiliated and saddened to think that any department of the Government would exercise this technical or arbitrary power and deprive soldiers of the uniform. They can not all buy civilian clothes when they get back. They have not the money with which to buy them, and if they wear civilian overcoats over clothing military in character to keep them warm they are apprehended. Now, that is not right. This makes for disorder and it makes for the very things that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado are combating.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I did not hear the entire statement made by the Senator. I can not conceive and it seems incredible to me that the Department of Justice has, as he says,



any jurisdiction in the matter or any business with it at all. What order can the Department of Justice make in regard to a man wearing his uniform?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The busybodies of the Department of Justice are too numerous and their ramifications too many for any ordinary man to fully comprehend. I have seen them in their activities over and over again. Several years ago I saw in the Senator's own State the activities of agents of the Department of Justice along our border, where warrants were not required to place citizens under arrest. Their activities are numerous, and too numerous for the ordinary man to comprehend. But what I say to you now has been put up directly to the War Department. Gen. McIntyre—and I do not think I am violating any confidence—said this morning that their view of the right of the soldier to wear his uniform and the view of the Department of Justice are seriously different. I assert that in the streets of the city of Detroit soldiers returning from service to their country have been apprehended by agents of the Department of Justice for wearing their uniforms in the streets of that city. I think it is outrageous, and it makes for this disorder of which Senators complain. It makes for disrespect of government and law and it dampens the ardor of the patriot willing to give his life for his country and yet not permitted to wear in private life the uniform he has honored.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. May I have one moment more?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We passed a bill here providing that a soldier could wear his uniform and own it; that it should be his. It was most appropriate legislation. I think the bill went through the Senate practically unanimously. I understand the same legislation has passed the House in a little different form, but the two bodies have not reconciled their differences, and in that interim the law which the Department of Justice construes one way and the War Department another is permitted to stand.

I do not think that many men in the Government of this country, from the highest to the lowest will approve of the pernicious activities of the Department of Justice officials in apprehending soldier boys for wearing their uniforms upon the streets of one of the great cities of this country.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that I know of thousands of men who have been discharged from the Army who are still wearing their uniforms, and there is no objection. What the Senator now states is something entirely new to me. I can not conceive of the condition being very extensive, at least to which the Senator has referred. I have not heard of any objection being interposed by the Department of Justice or by any Government official to the discharged soldiers wearing their uniforms.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I hope—

Mr. KING. Just in conclusion, I do not think the Senator from Michigan intends to launch a general criticism of the work of the Department of Justice and its agents during the period of the war through which we have just passed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No.

Mr. KING. I think the Department of Justice has done admirable work.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Splendid.

Mr. KING. Thousands of patriotic citizens all over the United States have voluntarily cooperated with the administration. I know Mr. Bielaski, a Republican by the way, has attempted to discharge the duties of that important trust with fidelity and with ability. While I have differed from him in many, many particulars, because I come in contact with him very frequently, I feel constrained—and, indeed, it is a pleasure—to say that so far as I could observe he has tried to do his duty as a faithful public servant and a patriotic American. I think that the Department of Justice has earnestly and honestly tried to administer the law and to uphold the hands of the Chief Magistrate of our Government in the carrying out of the immense responsibilities resting upon him and upon all officials of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I agree with the Senator from Utah. The Department of Justice has done excellent work. I go one step further than the Senator from Utah and say that Mr. Bielaski's management of his very onerous and burdensome department has been decidedly to his credit and successful from every point of view.

I am not launching a general criticism against the department, but I do say that the construction of the present law by the War Department and its announcement to the world of the construction of the present law by the Department of Justice and its purpose and plan, as evidenced in the city of Detroit par-

ticularly, calls for condemnation and makes, in my opinion, for that lawlessness and disregard for our institutions which ought not to be permitted to grow.

The only point I rose to emphasize was the point made by the Senator from Massachusetts and that of the Senator from Utah, that it is not necessary to spend money to get propaganda against the Government if the Government itself, either thoughtlessly or unintentionally, is using its power against the ordinary deencies of civil life.

Now, that is all I am complaining about. I can not think of anything much more humiliating than to have a boy apprehended for wearing his uniform. There is not a jury in the United States that could convict that boy of violating any law of the country.

If the representatives of the Department of Justice in the city of Detroit are pursuing those tactics, which I am informed they are, and reliably informed, it ought to be stopped. Better than that, the conference committee should get together and give this boy his uniform to take home with him.

One of the lessons of my youth that I never will forget as long as I live was the uniform of an uncle hanging upon the wall of his humble cottage in his little country home in Michigan. I read out of it lessons of patriotism which I have never forgotten, and at his knee I heard of the sufferings of himself and his comrades. He did not parade his virtues; he had many of the weaknesses of which human nature complains; but he had been a patriot, and I have loved his memory from my youth, because there was attached to his service as a private soldier in the service of his country, which his uniform attested, his old gun and his old cap and his canteen.

We must not permit through any laxity of legislation these soldiers to be degraded and imposed upon for wearing the uniform if they desire to wear it and if they need to wear it. We must not permit them to be degraded by our laxity or by the overofficialness of the officers of one department of the Government in contradiction to the wishes of another department of the Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly; but I have not the floor.

Mr. KING. With the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The floor belongs to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I yield it back. I only intended to emphasize that one thought, and I leave it there.

Mr. KING. As soon as the Senator from Michigan made his statement I immediately called up the Department of Justice to ascertain what the facts were with respect to the grave accusation made by the Senator. I have just been informed by the Assistant Attorney General who has charge of these matters that no such instructions were ever given; that no such interpretation by the Department of Justice has been placed upon the law as is suggested by the Senator from Michigan. They never heard of an arrest and never authorized an arrest, and never have placed that interpretation upon the law, and if any officious, bumptious person in Michigan masquerading as a representative of the Department of Justice—perhaps, indeed, a representative of the Department of Justice—has pursued the course suggested by the Senator, my advice is from Mr. Bryan that his act was not authorized and he has exceeded any authority which was conferred upon him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think if the Senator had called up the War Department—

Mr. KING. I called up the Department of Justice.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He would have found out from Gen. McIntyre that there is a disagreement between that department and the Department of Justice. But I am glad to have this information from the head of the department. I have always found them reasonable; but some overofficial and over-exacting official out there has caused these boys to be humiliated and disgraced. That information comes to me without question, and I rely upon it.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, if I had had an opportunity previously I should have expressed the opinion, or the hope, at least, that the Senator from Michigan was mistaken in the statement which has been brought to him. Certainly such action could only be taken by a bumptious official and in total disregard of law. I do not think that any such action as that is general. There are reasons enough why this condition is spreading throughout the United States, in my opinion, without citing individual cases which may have happened in some particular locality.

But what I arose, Mr. President, to discuss very briefly was the matter which is really before the Senate, and that is the appropriation for the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; not particularly relating to that canal, but in relation to a complete



system of intercoastal canals from Maine to North Carolina, at least. I think it has been demonstrated very clearly during this war that one of the most useful purposes for which Government appropriations might be used would be the perfection of such a canal system. It is not only in a sense a military requirement, but it is a commercial requirement of the very highest order.

Let me refer for just a moment to the Cape Cod Canal in Massachusetts, for it is not necessary, I think, to do so in detail. But heretofore all the shipping going north of Cape Cod on the Atlantic coast has had to pass around the end of that cape. It is most dangerous navigation, and the end of Cape Cod is literally strewn with the wrecks which have taken place there. The number of lives lost every year is considerable, and the loss of property is very great. The Cape Cod Canal, which has now been taken over by the Government, because of military as well as commercial requirements, and which would furnish a link in this intercoastal system, will in just one item save to the people of New England north of that cape in the transportation of coal practically a million dollars a year, and not only save that in money but will save many lives and a very considerable amount of time.

For example, a vessel going from New York to Boston can use that canal and save about half the pilotage fees which would be required if it went around the cape. It is a neighborhood of fogs, and frequently Nantucket Sound is filled with vessels waiting for clear weather, so that they can get across Pollocks Rips and around the cape. I have myself remained there on a sailing vessel for three days waiting for an opportunity to get around. So when you consider the question of the loss of life, the loss of time, and the loss of money, it is of vital importance to navigation on our coast that that canal should be in operation, and it should be put in operation so as to be available for every class of vessels, including the dreadnaughts of our battle fleet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely desire to suggest, in corroboration of what the Senator from Massachusetts has been saying, that everything which he has said with regard to Cape Cod and the navigation around there in the vicinity of Nantucket and all along that coast applies with double force to the navigation around Cape Hatteras, which ought to be protected as far as possible by an intercoastal canal.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has correctly stated the case in its application to Cape Hatteras.

The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is a part of that system; and if we should complete the so-called Raritan Canal through New Jersey, and the Cape Hatteras Canal through the sounds of North Carolina, we should have from north to south a complete system of internal waterways. It would save time, save life, and perhaps be of material advantage in case we ever again became engaged in war.

Therefore at this time, when we have great numbers of men out of employment, when we are going to have more out of employment, when there is much discussion of undertaking governmental activities for the purpose of giving employment, I submit to the Senate that no more valuable use could be made of the Government's money and of the time of the men now needing employment, than to complete or to undertake this very beneficent public work. I therefore hope that, as one link in the chain, this appropriation for the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal will be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the pending amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,500,000; completing," and to insert "\$1,000,000; for"; and on page 6, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$2,571,080" and insert "\$1,071,080," so as to make the clause read:

Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea, \$1,000,000; for improvement at Camden, N. J., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1120, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$71,080; in all, \$1,071,080.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Chair will pardon me, I wish to say that I think the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] desires to make some observations on that item. I know last evening he asked to have it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment having been declared carried, the Chair suggests that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Fletcher], in charge of the bill, will doubtless

move to reconsider the action of the Senate, if the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] shall desire to speak on the amendment.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Utah desires to submit any observations on the amendment, I suggest that that ought to be done.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that we proceed in the regular way, and then, if the Senator from Utah desires to be heard upon the amendment, I shall be willing to make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KENYON. I notice that the Senator from Utah has been called out for a few moments, but I think the matter can be again taken up when he comes back, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. FLETCHER. We will take the matter up again when the Senator from Utah returns to the Chamber, if it shall be then so desired.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 6, line 8, before the word "improvement," to strike out "Completing" and insert "For maintenance, \$20,000; for"; and in line 10, after "\$39,770," to insert "in all, \$59,770," so as to make the clause read:

Cooper, Salem, Cohasset, and Maurice Rivers, Woodbury, Mantua, Raccoon, Oldmans, and Alloway Creeks, N. J.: For maintenance, \$20,000; for improvement of Raccoon Creek in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 800, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$39,770; in all, \$59,770.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if either of the Senators from New Jersey is here, may we not have some information as to the importance of Raccoon Creek, as to what it is? I have not been able to find the House document in reference to the matter. It may be that the chairman of the committee has it.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is a project which is new, and the original estimate of the engineers for it was \$39,770 to complete it; but there seemed to be a question whether or not that would entirely complete it, and the engineers stated that that amount could be advantageously and profitably spent, so we changed the word "completing" to "for" and let the item stand as it came from the other House, at \$39,770.

It is shown by the document I have here, which is House Document No. 800, Sixty-third Congress, second session—

Mr. KENYON. What is the proposition?

Mr. FLETCHER. This document shows as to Raccoon Creek as follows:

2. Raccoon Creek is a crooked tidal stream emptying into the Delaware River about 18 miles below Philadelphia. The existing project for its improvement contemplates the formation of a dredged channel 7 feet deep and 75 feet in width at mean low water from the mouth to Bridgeport, thence a channel of the same depth and 60 feet wide to Springers Wharf, and thence a channel 5 feet deep at mean low water and 40 feet in width to the head of navigation at Swedesboro, with a cut-off at Molonox Shoal. This project is practically completed. It appears that the additional improvements now desired are the extension of the 7-foot depth to Swedesboro and the protection of the mouth. The district officer states that the heaviest receipts and shipments are made at the wharves at Swedesboro, for which reason he believes that the full depth of 7 feet should be carried to that point. He further states that a broad shoal has formed at the mouth of Raccoon Creek, which will require annual dredging or the construction of a jetty. The estimated cost of extending the 7-foot channel to Swedesboro and dredging between the mouth of the creek and the 7-foot curve in Delaware River is \$25,300.

In other words, the division engineer disagreed with the district engineer as to the length of that jetty, but the division engineer recommends that it be constructed, as I have said, at a cost of \$39,770. Then, the report further says:

4. After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in general with the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the further improvement by the United States of Raccoon Creek, N. J., is deemed advisable under a modification of the existing project providing for a channel 7 feet deep at mean low water from the inner channel of Delaware River to Swedesboro, 75 feet wide to Bridgeport, thence 60 feet wide to Springers Wharf, and thence 40 feet wide to Swedesboro, with a dike at the mouth, at an estimated cost of \$39,770 for first construction and about \$5,000 annually for maintenance. The full amount of the estimate should be provided in one appropriation. It should be noted that the present project has been practically completed for considerably less than its estimated cost, and that the estimate of the work now proposed is only about \$4,400 more than the unappropriated balance of the estimate for the existing project.

The committee thought that the whole project might be completed for that estimate of \$39,770, and therefore we did not change that; but, for fear that it might not be fully completed, we changed the word "completing" to the word "for," so that it would read, "for the improvement" instead of "for completing the improvement."

Mr. KENYON. The appropriation is not enlarged?

Mr. FLETCHER. The total is enlarged, as the Senator will see. That is caused by the maintenance item of \$20,000 which we added for the other projects. That was done on the recommendation of the engineer. He thought that the available balances for some of the other projects might not be sufficient



properly to maintain them and that he would need \$20,000 more in order to maintain properly the projects named in the lump-sum item.

Mr. KENYON. In striking out the word "Completing" and in inserting the words "For maintenance," does that mean that \$20,000 would have completed the project?

Mr. FLETCHER. No. As the bill came from the House there was no provision made for the maintenance of those items at all; they were simply named, and then the sentence began "Completing improvement of Raccoon Creek." There was really a lack of provision for maintenance, although the purpose was that there should be an appropriation for maintenance for the projects named in the beginning of that paragraph. The committee, in order to complete the provision, inserted the words "For maintenance." It was really an oversight, I think, upon the part of the House in not putting in the words "For maintenance" there. Their purpose was to have those projects maintained, but they did not provide any appropriation whatever for maintenance and did not use the language "For maintenance."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator will recollect that the statement was made that the reason for the items appearing as they did in the House bill, grouping a number of projects together without any appropriation being made for maintenance, and then the appropriation following for completing the improvements, was that they believed there would be sufficient funds either left over from the appropriation for the improvement or that the engineers might use necessary amounts from a general fund for the maintenance of these items where no specific appropriation was made, but they desired to have them included in the bill, so that the engineers would be permitted to use the other funds for the purpose of maintenance.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENYON. Then, there is an unexpended balance in connection with these items?

Mr. LENROOT. In many cases there are unexpended balances.

Mr. FLETCHER. And the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Taylor, in recommending this item felt it was advisable to ask the further odd sum of \$20,000, so as to make provision for the maintenance of those projects.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, in these river and harbor bills it is sometimes difficult to tell, without a very close study, whether the streams set forth in the bill as creeks are, in fact, creeks or inlets from the sea. I have been opposed to the numerous items we have had in river and harbor bills for streams that seemed to be simply creeks, but I appreciate the fact that there have been instances where inlets from the sea, with a great deal of commerce, have been designated as creeks. I think that is rather unfortunate and leads to a wrong impression.

We have had Raccoon Creek before us for consideration for many years. I think it was first ably defended by former Senator Martine, who could defend these New Jersey projects with a great deal of vigor and persuasiveness.

In the report of the engineers as to this creek I find, on page 407 of part 1, this language:

Original condition: The creek was crooked and obstructed by numerous shoals. It had an available depth of 4 feet between the mouth and Bridgeport, 1½ miles, and thence of 3 feet to Swedesboro, the head of navigation, 9.75 miles from the entrance.

I take it that Raccoon Creek, from that description, is not a very important or necessary waterway. The engineer does state that by the work that has been done in the past the carrying of perishable freight has been facilitated, so that much good has been accomplished. There was an unexpended balance July 1, 1917, of \$4,950.64; the amount allotted in the river and harbor act of August 8, 1917, was \$5,000, making \$9,950.64. I suppose if the improvement of this great waterway was not to be completed that sum would have been amply sufficient to have carried on the necessary work of maintenance.

There seems to have been no operations during the last fiscal year. The work was suspended January 3, 1917, and it does not seem to have been resumed, which may account to some extent for the paucity of a showing as to the commerce. The total commerce seems to have been 37,085 tons. We have appropriated altogether for this creek \$97,500. It really seems to me, so far as the evidence disclosed in the report is concerned, that this is one of the waterways the expenditure of the public money on which is wasteful.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, did the Senator observe that this creek is so important, its proportions are so immense that it is denominated as being crooked and has numerous shoals?

Mr. KENYON. I knew it was crooked.

Mr. KING. It has an available depth of 4 feet between the mouth and Bridgeport, 1½ miles, and thence of 3 feet to Swedesboro, the head of navigation.

Mr. KENYON. Where is Swedesboro? Does the Senator know where Swedesboro is?

Mr. KING. It is on Raccoon Creek, and Raccoon Creek is near Swedesboro. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENYON. Swedesboro is the head of navigation of Raccoon Creek?

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the commerce on this creek in 1913 was 89,075 tons, valued at \$1,158,170. Now, that is a right considerable commerce.

Mr. KENYON. What year is that, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. RANSDELL. 1913. The Senator has correctly stated that the report shows that the commerce of 1917 was 37,085 tons, valued at \$307,179; but the Senator failed to call the attention of the Senate to this very important item on page 408, under the paragraph "Commercial statistics," which reads in this way:

The usual draft of loaded vessels is from 4 to 7 feet. The general character of the commerce for the calendar year was crude oil, farm produce, manure, grain, oyster shells, and tomatoes.

Evidently it is a farming community.

The decrease in commerce is due to it being impracticable to obtain complete reports.

Mr. KENYON. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. RANSDELL. That is on page 408 of the first volume of the report.

Mr. KENYON. For 1918?

Mr. RANSDELL. For 1918, part 1, the same that the Senator was reading from; the last paragraph on page 408.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANSDELL. Pardon me until I finish, and then the Senator can ask his question.

The decrease in commerce is due to it being impracticable to obtain complete reports.

I do not know exactly the situation there, Mr. President; but I do know that on a good many of these smaller waterways gasoline boats carry a very considerable commerce, which in the aggregate amounts to a great deal of commerce, and that it is very, very valuable to the small communities. This is not one of the big things, it is true. It is only a few dollars; but those small communities must be taken care of just as well as the big ones, and it is almost impossible to get accurate statistics on the smaller class of boats like the gasoline boats. I can refer the Senator to a river in my own State, Louisiana—Terrebonne Bayou, it is called—which has 1,000 boats on it, and you will find hardly any statistics in regard to the commerce, but in the aggregate it is a very important commerce; and I have no doubt that the commerce on Raccoon Creek, which in 1913 was 80,000 tons, worth over a million dollars, is still a valuable commerce.

Mr. KENYON. I want to substantiate the statement of the Senator. I agree with the Senator that the record shows that oftentimes, as a result of the burning up of the boat, we do not get the commercial statistics. For instance, on Newbegun Creek the gasoline boat was burned up and the engineers reported that they could not get any statistics.

Mr. RANSDELL. But the report does not say that a boat burned up in this case. The engineers say that the decrease in commerce is due to its being practically impossible to obtain complete reports. They do not intimate that a boat burned up.

Mr. KENYON. No; but I am substantiating the Senator's argument by referring to Newbegun Creek, where the one boat burned up, and so the engineers say we can have no statistics. The Senator is correct on that point.

Mr. RANSDELL. That might be true as to Newbegun Creek; there might have been only one boat there, and, of course, if that boat burned there would be no commerce; but evidently that is not the situation here, when the official statistics show that five years ago there were 89,000 tons of commerce, worth over \$1,000,000. Surely it took more than one boat to carry all of that commerce, especially when those are very small boats of only about 4 feet draft.

Mr. KENYON. And it is very serious, of course, when the only boat on the creek burns up.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is probably true. If the Senator says so, I suppose it is true. I would not dispute his statement. If he knows that, I will accept it as correct.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was just going to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that in many instances, as I have read through hundreds and thousands of pages of these reports, we find that the commerce constantly diminishes upon the creeks.

In many instances it diminishes, because the railroads invade the territory, and their rates are so much lower and the transportation is so much quicker that as a result they cease to utilize the so-called waterways for the purpose of transportation. Then in many other instances the people devote themselves to entirely different occupations as the country changes, so that instead of exporting certain products they may be giving their attention to the production of other matters that do not call for export; or if for export, export in a different way.

I just want to suggest to the Senator, however, in connection with the statement that this creek in its palmy days had the immense tonnage referred to by the Senator from Louisiana, that I know of mines in the West that have an output of 40,000 tons a day, and they do not ask the Government to carry that freight for them. They have to build their own wagon ways and roadways and railroads for the purpose of conveying their freight. I know of hundreds and hundreds of farmers in the West and in the Middle States who produce thousands of tons of farm products during the year. They have to construct their own wagon ways and roadways to the railroads for the purpose of transporting their commodities. The Government does not bring to them a railroad or bring to their farms or to their mines the instrumentalities for the transportation of their commerce. Private business does it; private initiative does it; corporations do it. But it seems that the plan now is that if there is an infinitesimal creek, or if there is a swale, the Government must, then, out of the creek construct a waterway; and if there is no water there, sink artesian wells or something of that nature and pump water into the swale for the purpose of carrying to market the commerce of the inhabitants of that vicinity.

Mr. KENYON. Now, the Senator raises a question that we always have up in every river and harbor discussion, as to the railroads. I wonder if the Senator has observed the annual report of the Director General of Railroads on inland waterways?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, before the Senator gets on to that subject, may I say a word about Raccoon Creek? I am afraid the name may prejudice this project.

Mr. KENYON. I am coming back to Raccoon Creek.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply want to call the Senator's attention to just what this project is. It may save him some trouble to investigate it.

The additional improvements now desired are the extension of the 7-foot depth to Swedesboro and the protection of the mouth.

Now, the engineer says:

I have personally examined this stream on several occasions, recently for the purpose of preparing this report.

The traffic of the stream is carried by gasoline boats and barges, by one steamboat plying daily between Bridgeport and Philadelphia, and by occasional steam tugs with barges. Mr. Miller reports 34 vessels regularly employed, with an aggregate tonnage of 4,823, and drafts between 4 and 6 feet. In 1912 the commerce amounted to 92,688 short tons, valued at \$1,163,700. About 21 landings and wharves are used. The incoming freight consists principally of fertilizers, coal, building and road materials, and domestic commodities. The outgoing freight is farm produce, fruit, and truck. Vegetables are shipped in large quantities by rail to Boston and other eastern cities, and by boat to Philadelphia, Chester, and other places on the Delaware River. For shipments of this kind, Raccoon Creek ranks near the head of the list of tributaries of Delaware River and Bay.

That is the kind of stream this is. It is one of the important tributaries of the Delaware River. Because it is named Raccoon Creek, we ought not to deprive it of the improvement to which it is entitled; and I will state that the project was originally adopted away back in 1882.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the name ought to prejudice it. We ought to appropriate liberally to take care of the mouth of Raccoon Creek.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can see that the term "creek" does not dignify it sufficiently, but the report further says:

The heaviest receipts and shipments are made at the wharves at Swedesboro, for which reason the full depth of 7 feet should be carried to that point.

That is the reason why they want to carry the improvement up to Swedesboro. Those are the real facts about the merits of the project.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad the Senator has defended it so well. I want to get back now to the question of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him just one moment before he proceeds with a general discussion?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the State of New Jersey has made any contribution toward this waterway?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think so.

Mr. KING. Has it contributed a dollar to any of these creeks and inlets and streams, some of which are so minute as to be unknown, upon which millions of dollars have been expended by the Government?

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not say as to that.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator have the audacity to suggest that they should?

Mr. FLETCHER. I would have to look over all the projects in New Jersey. I can not say as to that.

Mr. KING. My understanding is that the State of New Jersey has made no appropriation for this project. My information is that notwithstanding millions of dollars have been expended by the United States upon harbors and creeks and streams in New Jersey, the latter has made no contribution, though many of them are for local purposes and serve local ends.

Mr. KENYON. What is the use of the State appropriating, if the Government will take care of it?

Mr. KING. I understand that there are a few States in the Union that have recognized the propriety and justice of the situation and have had the honor to do something with respect to the improvement of streams within their borders, some of which have been purely local. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] whether his State is on the roll of honor or on the roll of dishonor in respect to these appropriations?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that the rule does not permit a Senator to refer disparagingly to a State of the Union.

Mr. KING. These appropriations are all considered so honorable that I supposed designating them as dishonorable would not change the result.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have enough trouble about this bill, without rowing about what are good and bad States.

Mr. KING. I will inquire of the Senator whether his State is on the roll of States which have made appropriations for the improvement of their own waterways?

Mr. KENYON. That raises a parliamentary question. Is a reference to a State getting appropriations a reflection on the State?

Mr. KING. Apparently that seems to be the rule, as I interpret the remark of the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; but the Senator from Utah used language that approached very closely to an infringement of the rule. He spoke of honorable and dishonorable States, and he asked if the State of Massachusetts was on the honorable or the dishonorable list. That is a plain violation of the rule.

Mr. KING. On the roll of honor or on the roll of dishonor. I submit that it is not honorable for a State to fail to make appropriations for purely local purposes, and to impose upon the Federal Government duties and burdens which rest upon them, and that when States do make appropriations for rivers and harbors it is an honorable thing; and I ask the Senator whether his State has done the honorable thing?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that that is out of order, and a violation of the rule.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I submit that it is a very honorable thing for a State to make an appropriation for rivers and harbors for local matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is all right.

Mr. KING. I do not think it is a very honorable thing for a State to come here and impose upon the Federal Government and ask for appropriations for matters that are purely local. I should think that it was not an honorable thing for a man to come here and ask for Federal appropriations for purely private concerns. I do not think, in the realm of ethics, that it is a very honorable thing for States to shirk functions which devolve upon them and put them over on the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must stop this. There is not any showing in this bill that any State of the Union has come here and asked for anything, and the Senator from Utah is speaking offensively about States of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Utah know that the States have no control over navigable waterways?

Mr. KING. I was speaking in general terms, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Take a State that has a stream entirely within its borders, such as the raging Ocklawaha. Is it disrespectful to talk here about appropriations going into a State that are for a stream entirely within the borders of the State?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, the Chair has not so held. The Chair does not care how Senators criticize these creeks and appropriations. They can say anything they please about them,



If they do not try to divide off the States of the Union into honorable and dishonorable States and if they do not attempt to inject into the Record the statement, which is not a fact, that any State of the Union has come here and asked for appropriations. There is no showing of that kind. This bill is reported by the Committee on Commerce, and there is not in the Record or in the report a single thing that shows that any State government has ever come to this Congress and asked for an appropriation for rivers and harbors, until this morning there was a memorial of the Legislature of Missouri. When we reach that question, if it ever comes up, the Chair will rule on it.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the Senator intended to reflect on States. I think we have a right to discuss these Federal appropriations which go entirely into States, such as the instance I have cited.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no desire, of course, to reflect upon any State. As Senators know, I have contended here for the States, for their honor and dignity and against what I have considered to be the tendency of the times, to submerge the States in a strong federalism. I love and honor the States and behold in them sovereigns, governments indestructible, having important functions to discharge. I submit that the policy of Congress in making appropriations for small, invisible creeks and streams, not navigable, and in the interest of purely local districts, has not been creditable. Such appropriations have been condemned by Senators and Congressmen. One of the most eminent men in public life, Mr. Burton, former Senator from Ohio, in this Chamber and on the floor of the House, and in public utterances since he left the Senate, has denounced many of the rivers and harbors bills which have passed through Congress. He denounced them because there were unknown creeks and streams that were receiving large contributions from the parent Government—streams which, if they were susceptible of any commerce, ought to have been developed by the States themselves, because they were purely local, and not by the Federal Government.

I am condemning appropriations made by the Federal Government for the benefit of purely local sections, and also large appropriations upon navigable streams where there was no commerce and upon which there never will be commerce. An examination of the hundreds of projects which have drawn approximately \$1,000,000,000 will convince any fair-minded person that hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted. If the State of Massachusetts has made contributions for the development of its rivers, creeks, and harbors, I think it was fair just as well as an honorable thing for it to do. I beg, however, to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa, whether his State has made contributions for the purposes just mentioned?

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator from Iowa let me ask a question of the Senator from Utah? The Senator from Utah has stated that former Senator Burton, who certainly was a great man, has denounced the river and harbor bill. I wish to ask him if the former Senator Burton was not chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives from 1898 until, if I mistake not, March 4, 1909, a period of about 12 years, and if he did not include in the river and harbor bills which he reported, whenever a river and harbor bill was adopted, the very item now in discussion, Racoon Creek, and if he did not include in the river and harbor bill nearly all the other creeks that have been criticized from time to time by the Senator; and, further, if the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, was not such a forceful man that if he had opposed the item the other members of the committee could not have included it in the bill over his protest?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator do me the kindness to yield for a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Of course, I can not answer all of the questions propounded by my esteemed friend from Louisiana as to what were included within the bills during the time the Senator to whom he refers was chairman of the committee. I know he was chairman of the committee for many years. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to read a word or two of what former Senator Burton did say. Senator Burton said in an article which he wrote appearing in *World's Work* for February, 1913:

For years we have been struggling under a vicious system of river and harbor improvements. For instance, the river and harbor bill of 1910 contained items favoring 296 out of the 391 congressional districts. This bill was a masterpiece of geographical distribution and a striking tribute to the cohesive power of legislative logrolling. Even the obstacle offered by mountains of considerable size did not prevent certain portions of the country from being represented in this bill.

Now, there are two ways of framing a river and harbor bill. The popular method of drawing a bill is to make such concessions to all the different States and localities that you will have an overwhelming

support for the measure. The other method, and the right one, is to select those projects which would benefit the whole country and then finish them with promptness. The first method is irresistible. It will win every time.

Proceeding he says:

This policy of piecemeal appropriations encourages extravagance and the adoption of injudicious and wasteful projects merely for the purpose of spending money in the greatest possible number of districts. When you give small appropriations to a large number of items it is an invitation to every Congressman who has a harbor, a creek, a well-developed spring to come in and ask for an appropriation in these bills. It is a very simple matter to come to Congress and secure \$100,000 on a project that will cost a million or two millions.

Then he asks, after the entering wedge has been made:

What! Will Congress, after it has committed itself to this great project, although costing a million dollars or more, drop it after \$100,000 has been spent and let the money expended be buried in the sea?

Then he proceeds:

In this way I have seen the most unwarranted and extravagant enterprises undertaken, apparently not so much to improve our waterways as to put the Government's money into circulation in the various congressional districts, in order to improve the chances of the different Members of Congress for reelection.

Proceeding, he says:

Communities and individuals, backed by a large share of the public press, whose pages teem with demands for economy and with condemnations of Congress for extravagance, are constantly insisting that large and sometimes utterly unjustifiable appropriations be made in their own locality. A Member of Congress is told, "If you do not get this appropriation for a public building or for this river or harbor, or if you do not join in a movement for this new line of activity, you will no longer be returned to office." Of course no man in public life wishes systematically to adopt a course which will prevent his return to the office he holds, though some theorists and political scientists seem to think the proper course for a Congressman is to go straight ahead to defeat.

Then he states further on:

Public buildings, river improvements, free seeds, departmental publications are being used to reelect Members to Congress. Bluntly, the people are furnishing the money by which they are being delivered.

Then he refers to a river in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, the Red River, and says:

For the last year traffic over this stretch of 476 miles below Fulton Harbor, aside from the saw logs which could be floated without any improvements, was 10 tons of grain, 16 tons of provisions, 26 tons of fish, and 10 tons of ice. In all, 62 tons were carried on these 476 miles of river. The river and harbor bill of 1912 carried an appropriation of \$50,000 for this stretch of the Red River. That is at the rate of \$806 for every ton of merchandise or grain carried on that river the preceding year. The amount expended for the year is practically eight times as much as all the value of the merchandise and freight carried. Two years ago it was 835 tons, and now it has dropped to 62 tons.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator—

Mr. RANDELL. May I ask just one question? I will promise to ask but one.

Mr. KENYON. I am willing to yield, but I am not willing for the Senator from Utah to read former Senator Burton's speech in my time. It would take, I think, a week.

Mr. KING. No; I was just reading from an article he wrote.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish the Senator from Utah would put in the reply which I made to that article. He told what he called the truth about our waterways, and I called my reply the real truth about our waterways. It was published in the Record. But I will not take the time of the Senate with that.

I simply wish to ask the Senator from Utah if he is not the author of a bill introduced in the Senate on December 11, 1918, which proposes to appropriate the sum of \$15,000,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, "for construction work and incidental operations for a reclamation project on Green and Grand Rivers, Utah, to be expended under the supervision of the Director of the Reclamation Service"? He wants half as much on that one project as this bill proposes to expend on all the waterways of the greatest country in the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the Senator sees exactly the reason for executing the rule. He is getting right into the question of a State, which the rule says a Senator must not offensively refer to.

Mr. RANDELL. If the Vice President will pardon me, I was going to say I have no objection in the world to this item; it may be all right; but I was asking the Senator, who has spoken of this roll of honor and dishonor here, if he did not introduce that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is ruled out.

Mr. RANDELL. I thank the Vice President for ruling it out.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, and if the Vice President will indulge me for a moment, the Government of the United States owns large tracts of fertile land within what are called the public-land States. Years ago it



adopted the policy of placing water upon these lands in order to sell them to home seekers. By this course it was enabled to form a market for its own land and at the same time benefit the entire Nation. Whether the policy was wise we need not discuss at this time. The Government of the United States is now considering a plan to aid the soldiers and sailors when they are discharged from the Army and Navy. This plan contemplates the reclamation of lands owned by the Government, and which, when water is applied thereon, prove to be agricultural lands of great value. The Government owns several million acres of most excellent land which can be irrigated from the waters of Green and Grand Rivers. Fifteen millions of dollars would reclaim hundreds of thousands of acres of these lands, and thus furnish homes for thousands of home seekers. This project would, in my opinion, be considered and developed if the suggestion of Secretary Lane relating to homes for soldiers and sailors are carried into effect. The bill to which the Senator refers is in aid of the program, which seems to meet with so much favor, that the Government should improve its own holdings in order to dispose of them, and at the same time aid genuine home seekers, and particularly those who have so heroically served the Nation in the conflict just ended.

Mr. RANDELL. If it be a good project, I certainly hope personally that it will be adopted. I would not pretend to denounce it as unwise. I simply asked the Senator from Utah if he did not introduce that bill.

Mr. KING. I did.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] desires to answer the question of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], which was addressed to him, and I have no objection.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] a day or two ago ask some Senator if his State had made any contribution to the improvement of rivers and harbors in which they were directly interested, and thinking he might ask me the question, I brought with me this morning a statement showing what Massachusetts has done.

My judgment is that Massachusetts has done and is doing about as much and more than it should, and that many of the expenditures the State has made are properly national expenditures; but, as I have the opportunity to do so, I wish to put in the Record the result of the operations along these lines of the State of Massachusetts in the year 1917. Massachusetts spent \$84,230.72 in general expenses and materials for improvements. It spent in the improvement of rivers and harbors: For Cotuit Harbor, \$1,090; for Barnstable and Mashpee Harbor, \$9,900; for the Connecticut River, \$7,698; for Duxbury Bay, \$1,235; for Falmouth, Waquoit Bay, \$10,219; for Gloucester Harbor, \$9,587; for Hull Harbor, \$38,284; for Hyannisport, \$1,152; for Ipswich River, \$3,073; for Lynn Harbor, \$21,419; for New Bedford Harbor, \$20,355; for Plymouth Harbor, \$7,673; and, in addition to that, for another harbor in Plymouth, \$6,664; for Warrens Cove, \$11,723; for Rockport Harbor, \$800; for Sandwich Harbor, \$9,444; for Scituate, \$1,057; for Scituate, First Cliff, \$1,585; for Scituate Harbor, \$8,425; for South Hadley Harbor, \$2,239; for Wareham River, \$21,809; for Winthrop Shore, \$1,000.87.

It spent, in addition to these improvements, for maintenance and operations of Pier 5, \$85,923; for the surveys and improvements of rivers and harbors under special appropriations, \$10,700; for the tidewater fund, \$1,425; for Mystic River improvement, \$153,572; for Income Harbor compensation fund, \$8,337; for improvement of South Bay in the city of Boston, \$2,096; for development in the port of Boston for various purposes, \$725,789; for expert and special services, \$609; for supplies and expenses, \$5,046, making a total for the port of Boston of \$774,799; for harbor-improvement loan, New Bedford, \$29,239; for harbor-improvement loan, Weymouth, Fore River, \$75,000.

Very recently the State contributed the same amount the General Government appropriated and the same amount the Fore River Ship Building Co. contributed for the development of Weymouth Fore River. For dredging Boston Harbor, \$18,844.

This makes a total, Mr. President, of \$1,461,295, of which about \$400,000 was spent in constructing a dock at Boston. That is in one year. I have not all the expenditures that have been made by the State of Massachusetts for rivers and harbors, of course. It would take a long time to compile them; but I have a letter in my possession relating to the proposition now pending in Congress to make a 40-foot channel in Boston Harbor, in which it is stated:

The United States has expended on Boston Harbor and its tributary rivers, etc., from 1825 to 1915, a period of 90 years, the sum of \$12,608,474.99, an average of \$140,760.83 per year.

The State of Massachusetts has expended and actually entered into contract to expend on Boston Harbor and its tributary rivers, etc.,

from 1870 to 1915, a period of 45 years, the sum of \$15,477,360.62, of which amount all but \$2,784,152.94 has actually been expended, making an average of \$343,719.03 per year by the State.

During 45 years the State of Massachusetts has expended upon Boston Harbor and rivers tributary thereto over \$3,000,000 more than the National Government has expended since the beginning of the river and harbor appropriation.

I do not contend, Mr. President, that all States should do as much, but I do contend that there should be in doubtful cases cooperation between the local community and the General Government. I do not think it should be the case in Boston Harbor, for example, which is distinctly national; nor in a great improvement like the Mississippi River or New York Harbor, but I do think in improvements essentially local there should be a plan of cooperation between the General Government and the local government which would modify to some degree this system of rivers and harbors improvements.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I really rose to ask some questions in regard to Raccoon Creek, but one thing has drifted to another until we have gotten rather far away from that creek. The inquiry of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] regarding his bill raises the same old question that if a Senator opposes certain appropriations in certain bills and later himself introduces an appropriation bill for other purposes he is rather estopped from questioning any appropriation bill here. I see no reason why a man should not be in favor of certain appropriations and against certain appropriations. I have been against the general plan under which river and harbor bills have been framed, not against doing great public works. I have been rather converted to the idea that the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is something of a good proposition or could be made one of national necessity and not merely to help some local community.

I have raised no voice against it in this Chamber at this session. That, it seems to me, can be made a great national canal. While it will require some expenditure of money, I am very frank in saying that my views about that canal have changed somewhat. I do not know that we ought to spend the money just now in the present condition of our Treasury, but it is an improvement that some day should be made.

What I have urged in the past is that we take the bill and try to cut out those things in it that are not of national concern but merely local. We need not deceive ourselves about it, or grow indignant about it. We know that in the past many of these items in the river and harbor bill, the same as in the public buildings bill, have been local not only in appropriation but in everything else. That is something to get away from in this country, to get nationalized in feeling and in action as well as in appropriations.

The Senator from Utah suggests competition of the railroads, and I started to talk about that and called his attention to the report of the Director General of Railroads. I do not know whether we are going to be able to make the great waterways of this country useful unless the Government owns and controls the railroad. I am not arguing for that proposition, because on that I confess that my mind has not reached a conclusion. But the director general in his report to Congress on that subject used this language, and I think it may be well to put it in the Record:

The increased responsibilities of this country in the family of nations will demand greater commercial activity on our part. Transportation is a major problem, for, on account of the extensive area of our country, we have a longer average haul to seaboard than other industrial commonwealths. It has seemed to me evident that by developing transportation on the waterways and coordinating and articulating them with a unified railway system, we shall bring about a correct solution of the rail-water controversy, which has been in progress for 50 years. This is possible with the railways under Federal control. I doubt if any of our rivers or canals will become active factors of transportation if the railroads are turned back to private control. The old methods of railway competition with the waterways doubtless will be revived and the waterway experiment may not be able to survive that competition.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, if the Senator has concluded that quotation, I wish to add to it a statement made by the Director General of Railroads before the Interstate Commerce Committee just exactly along the same line.

Mr. KENYON. I should be very glad to have that.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator has concluded that quotation, I should be glad to have this inserted in the Record. In the examination before the committee, the question of when the roads should be turned over to the owners arose before the Interstate Commerce Committee, and the Director General of Railroads made this statement within the past few weeks. Director General McAdoo said:

The intercoastal waterway from Philadelphia to Beaufort, N. C., will be susceptible of greater commercial developments. The projected improvement between Norfolk and Beaufort will not be completed for some



time, and it will require at least two years to modernize the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. This improvement, that is the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, ought to be authorized promptly, and I hope that Congress may grant the necessary appropriation and power to deal with the matter.

That is a very important connecting waterway there which could render very great service to the commercial center at Baltimore if it could be finished.

I thought the Senator would like to have the whole story go in the RECORD; and I thank him also for his kindly reference to the enterprise in which I have taken so much interest.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad the Senator put that in the RECORD. Of course, the railroads have helped to make almost impossible water-borne traffic. The Mississippi River is paralleled by railroads. If any river in the world ought to carry commerce it ought to be the Mississippi River, but it can not do it. I never thought the Missouri River improvement would amount to anything, and that every dollar we put into it would be an absolute waste, but the lower Mississippi is developing some commerce by barge lines that are placed there.

I did not intend and do not intend to take any more time of the Senate in the discussion of the bill. There are some of the items I want to discuss and have a vote upon when the time comes—the Ocklawaha River, which I believe is an indefensible proposition, and the Ouachita River, which is worse than indefensible.

But I want to recur to Raccoon Creek. I do not understand why the commerce has so decreased from 1913, when it was of a value of \$1,178,170 and consisted of 80,075 short tons, to 1914, to a value of \$350,970 and to 23,543 short tons. That is a tremendous decrease in the commerce of this mighty stream. In 1915 it seems to have gone back to the figures of 1913, and the commerce then shows a value of \$844,200 and short tons 89,638.

Oldmans Creek and Alloway Creek seem to be about in the same general situation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator from Iowa permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know very little about these appropriations or the improvements which are desired for the State of New Jersey. I am familiar, however, with one or two of the items which are in the bill.

The policy of Federal appropriations for these improvements has been oftentimes attacked on this floor. In fact, I have been here, I think, three sessions, and twice I have heard the eloquent attacks made by the Senator from Iowa upon the improvements desired by the State of New Jersey, and I am beginning to feel that it is becoming somewhat chronic.

Mr. KENYON. The appropriations or the attacks?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The attacks. I will defend the appropriations as best I can.

I, representing the State of New Jersey, do not want to be accused of trying to secure from the Federal Government for any project in that State any money that is not necessary or needful, but I do say that if it is the policy of the Federal Government to aid the States on the seaboard in improving the tidal streams of such a State in order that the water-borne traffic and commerce may continue, as long as that is the policy it is the duty of the Federal Government to continue it as far as the improvement of worthy projects is concerned.

I dislike to be accused of supporting any measure that savors of "pork," a popular term which has been carelessly and often, as far as New Jersey is concerned, untruthfully used in connection with this bill. It is not my fault that the Almighty placed New Jersey on the seaboard. I am very glad that He did so, but I do not want any benefit for my State that is not essential for the commerce not only of New Jersey but of the world at large. The Western States in this connection, in the improvement of the tidal streams in the State of New Jersey, enjoy directly or indirectly the benefit of that commerce.

I believe it is my duty as a Senator from New Jersey to support any worthy project which will develop the commerce of the country, whether that development is in Iowa, Utah, Colorado, or in the State of New Jersey. I believe I am a Senator of the United States, not a Senator entirely of the State of New Jersey. Now, in regard to—

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator—I agree with his position—does he believe it is the duty of Congress to appropriate funds for streams entirely within a State?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As long as they are tributary to the tidal waters of the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. KENYON. So you can engage in commerce with the world and with other States. But that is not the condition of

Raccoon Creek. If a river is entirely within a State, does the Senator believe it is then the province of the Government to appropriate funds for that stream?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know of no such project in my State, but I am answering the criticism of the Senator in regard to appropriations which are asked for in this bill.

Now, let me speak for a minute on the question of these appropriations. New Jersey is indented with many tidal streams. Those streams run varying from 5 to 10 and 15 miles inland. In the industrial centers, such as those on Newark Bay and the Kill Van Kull, these streams directly furnish water-borne traffic and transportation for many of those large industries, and they afford an outlet to New York Harbor.

Take the case of Cheesapeake Creek, which has been facetiously commented upon from time to time in this connection. I know of several million rounds of ammunition which were transported along that creek directly to the ships that carried it to the battle front on the other side, because one of the largest ammunition plants in the world was located along that creek in order that it might be near the shipping point in New York so as to transport this ammunition to the other side.

Take the creeks and rivers that have been mentioned and are grouped in the present item which is under criticism, for instance, Cooper River. Cooper River is a tidal stream, and along that stream are located many of the industries of southern New Jersey. There are located the Camden Iron Works, which had large Government contracts and were fabricating steel, I believe, for the war equipment of the Federal Government. While I do not know what the tonnage is on that stream, I do know that to afford the proper facilities by a certain water depth it is necessary, in order that an outlet may be afforded to that industry, that that stream should be properly dredged.

Take these other streams; they are called creeks; but creeks in New Jersey as mentioned here are tidal streams and not creeks such as are located in Iowa or Utah, which have water in them probably only six months in the year; but the tides ebb and flow in these creeks in New Jersey.

Along these creeks are located in southern New Jersey the farmers who furnish produce for the great cities of Philadelphia and Camden. Along these creeks the farmers ship their produce to market.

In pursuance of the requirement of the Federal Government, that practically 60 per cent of the tomato crop should be requisitioned, in order that the troops on the other side might be supplied, it was along these creeks that the farmers of New Jersey shipped their tomatoes to the factories, which canned them and made the soup and other food products for the Army on the other side.

So, I say, while it might appear to the Senator from Iowa that these projects are not necessary and are not worthy, he is mistaken. So far as I know from my observation and meager knowledge—for I have not made a study of this question; I have been on other committees, where I have conscientiously devoted my time to public affairs, such as the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency—but I do say, from the meager knowledge that I have on the subject, that I know of no project which is contained in this appropriation bill which is unworthy or which can be properly criticized.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I merely want to finish what I have to say. I have shown the facts about these New Jersey streams. Possibly they are all meritorious, but I am only guided by what the Army engineers say and am drawing conclusions from their statements.

I was glad to hear the Senator's statement about Senators representing the United States instead of individual States. That is good doctrine which has been preached here a great deal, but I think very seldom practiced. It runs a little contrary to the remarks of one of the officers of the river and harbor congress lately in session here, which generally meets just previous to the consideration of the river and harbor bill. Capt. Ellison—I think he was the secretary of one of the congresses—uttered this great sentiment:

We send a Congressman here to legislate for the Nation theoretically, but actually to get all he can for us, and, if he does not get our share and then some, we do our best to replace him.

I am glad that that doctrine does not find a response in Congress. I have said all I care to say about these streams in New Jersey, Mr. President, and I have no desire to delay matters.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he recollects what reasons were given for the amendment making an appropriation of \$20,000 for maintenance in this case?



Mr. FLETCHER. That was inserted by the committee on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. He stated that it would require that additional amount above the available balance on hand to the credit of those projects. There are available balances on hand, and the engineer stated that he would place that item for maintenance at \$20,000, because he felt that they would need that much.

Mr. LENROOT. It seems to me that in this particular case the engineers must have made a very serious mistake in their estimate, for I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the annual report on page 419. In the group of harbors embodied in this paragraph, including two small additional harbors upon which the maintenance charge is only \$1,000 a year, we find that upon the entire group in 1914 there was expended for maintenance \$18,000—I am giving round figures—in 1915, \$12,000; in 1916, \$18,000; in 1917, \$18,000; and in 1918, \$21,000, or an average of less than \$20,000 per year. Then, just at the bottom of the page, I read:

July 1, 1918, balance available, including \$42,624.66, available only for maintenance—

Showing that on the 1st of July last they had \$42,624.66 available only for maintenance, and upon the entire group we have been expending less than \$20,000 a year for the past five years. It seems to me, therefore, that very clearly a mistake has been made in this respect.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I can not get detailed information without further conference with Gen. Taylor; but the appropriation we have provided in the bill is based on his recommendations to the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not question that; but I think he must have made a mistake; it is very clear a mistake must have been made.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is possible; and, if it is desirable, suppose we pass that item at present and refer to it later?

Mr. LENROOT. That will be satisfactory, if the chairman will get a letter giving the reasons for this proposed action.

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall be very glad to get fuller information. It is possible we have made a mistake in putting the figures as we have them here; but I do not think that is likely. I suggest, Mr. President, that we pass over the item "for maintenance, \$20,000."

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection, Mr. President, let me also ask the Senator from Florida, while he is looking up the question of maintenance, to look up the question as to the amount that would be necessary to complete these projects. The House of Representatives provided that \$39,770 should complete the project, and the Senate committee struck out the word "completing" and made it "for maintenance, \$20,000"; and then for the improvement of Raccoon Creek, and so forth.

The Senator will remember that in all of the projects which are found on pages 3, 4, and 5 virtually the same amendment was made, and the amounts appropriated by the House were retained. But where the word "completing" was not stricken out and remained as the House had it, the amount was increased by 50 per cent. Would that apply in this case the same as it did in the other cases?

Mr. FLETCHER. If the committee should provide absolutely for completing this project of Raccoon Creek, it might be necessary to increase the amount; but the committee was advised that, while it might be possible to complete the improvement for that amount, it was not absolutely certain, and that, in any event, the amount of \$39,770 could be advantageously expended on the improvement. So we allowed the amount to stand as provided by the House and as estimated in the original document, striking out the word "completing" and inserting the words "for improvement." So we did not absolutely pledge ourselves that the improvement would be completed by the expenditure of this amount upon it; but in all probability it will be. If it should not, that amount can be expended profitably and advantageously, in any event.

In the item referred to on the other page by the Senator, it was perfectly clear that the amount shown in the original document would not complete the projects. It was insisted that they should be completed, not merely begun. Those were not such projects as might be partially worked on, then abandoned and left while waiting for further appropriations. So it was desirable to give in this bill the entire amount which was necessary to complete them. That is why we changed the amounts there, without changing the word "completing." We left in the word "completing" and changed the amount to a sufficient sum to complete the improvement.

In this instance we did not absolutely say that this amount would complete the project, but it may do so. We left the amount as it stood and simply provide that the work shall be done; that the improvement shall be made. Then the money is appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator to ascertain, if it is possible to do so, what amount it would take to complete these projects? Then I should like to see an appropriation made to complete them all.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that it is hoped that this appropriation will complete this project. There is also an available balance there, I believe.

Mr. SMOOT. That is for maintenance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; it is for maintenance. This appropriation may complete it—we do not know—but, at any rate, we feel justified in making that appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator, after he investigates this matter, will conclude that \$20,000 for maintenance is not necessary; that is, if he will look at the report, provided the report is correct, and if the past amounts for maintenance are adhered to for the coming year, I think he will find there will be an ample sum for maintenance for this project for the coming year.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator should understand that that refers to a different matter entirely. Maintenance refers to the projects listed above.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize that.

Mr. FLETCHER. This amount is confined to one project—Raccoon Creek.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee will remember that Gen. Taylor urged completion in only two classes of cases, one where estimates had been so recently made that the estimated amount would complete the project, and another class of cases where it would be poor economy to go on with a portion of the work and leave it uncompleted and then take it up later. But as to many of these improvements, as in this case, the project is really in two separate parts. In this instance one proposes the building of a jetty, as I remember, and the other the deepening of the channel. Therefore the engineers can complete a portion of this improvement without any economic loss and let the remainder of it go until a later time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. I am much obliged to the Senator from Wisconsin for clearing that up as he has done. That is the precise situation here, and that is the reason why we did not propose to increase this amount. We thought the amount ought to stand and that the improvement should be continued as far as possible.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the explanation of the Senator from Wisconsin clears the matter so that we now understand just what is desired and what the work will be for the coming year. As I understand, the Senator from Florida is going to allow that amendment to go over in order to look up the question as to the amount for maintenance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; the item as to maintenance; but the Senator does not desire the other item for the improvement of Raccoon Creek to go over, I take it?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not care about that. After the explanation of the Senator from Wisconsin, it seems to be perfectly clear that this amount will be necessary for that particular project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Without objection, the amendment providing "for maintenance, \$20,000," will be passed over, at the request of the chairman of the committee, and the total will be changed.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no need of changing the total, because if the item for maintenance is not left in the bill, of course the amount of the appropriation provided by the House will still remain.

Mr. FLETCHER. But we will have to change the total if we reduce the maintenance item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment changing the total will also be passed over. The Secretary will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 6, line 13, after "\$20,000," to strike out "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended on Absecon Inlet," so as to make the clause read:

Cold Spring and Absecon Inlets, Absecon and Tuckerton Creeks, and Toms River, N. J.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida state whether there is any information at all from the engineers as to why that provision should be stricken out? The House evidently thought that there should be no money expended upon that inlet.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to state to the Senator that the reason why the committee felt justified in striking that out was because we had the assurance of the engineers that in the esti-



mate of \$20,000 Absecon Inlet was not included, and, therefore, the money would not be spent there anyhow, and so there is no use of inserting a proviso to that effect.

Mr. SMOOT. Is Absecon Inlet completed?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is completed and is not one of the items needing any of this fund for maintenance. I repeat, none of this money will be spent on Absecon Inlet anyhow. We have the assurance of the engineers to that effect.

Mr. SMOOT. What I was thinking was whether, if the improvement there has been completed, it would not be well to strike out the words, in line 11, "and Absecon Inlet"?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was thought best to keep that item there. It is in the list of items that have been carried in the bill, and it was not deemed wise to eliminate it entirely from the provision, but none of that money, I repeat, will go for Absecon Inlet, mentioned in the proviso. Therefore we struck out the proviso. I think it better to do that, because otherwise it would be a limitation that it is not necessary to put in the bill, and a sort of reflection on the inlet, which it is thought unnecessary to make.

Mr. SMOOT. There may be an unexpended balance for that inlet. Does the Senator know whether there is?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; there will be none. This entire amount is intended for other maintenance than that at Absecon Inlet.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 6, line 15, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for," so as to make the clause read:

Chester River, Pa.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 667, Sixty-second Congress, second session, \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$65,000," so as to make the clause read:

Wilmington Harbor, Del.: For maintenance, \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for maintenance, \$9,000; for"; in line 7, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for"; in line 11, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$53,134" and insert "\$62,134," so as to make the clause read:

Rockhall, Queenstown, Claiborne, Tilghman Island, Cambridge, and Crisfield Harbors, Elk and Little Elk, Chester, Corsica, Choptank, Tuckahoe, Warwick, La Trappe, Tred Avon, Wicomico, Manokin, and Pocomoke Rivers, Slaughter, Tyaskin, and Broad Creeks, Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, and Lower Thoroughfare, Deal Island, Md.; Nanticoke River (including Northwest Fork), Del. and Md.; Broad Creek River, Del.; and Tangier Channel, Va.: For maintenance, \$9,000; for improvement of the North Fork of Tred Avon River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 27, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$19,600; for improvement of Wicomico River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1509, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$17,100; for improvement of Tangier Channel in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 107, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$16,434; in all, \$62,134. The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for Tilghman Island Harbor is hereby made available for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 796, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to insert:

Potomac River at Washington, D. C., at Alexandria, Va., and Lower Cedar Point, Md.; Anacostia River, D. C.; Occoquan, Aquia, Upper Machodoc, and Nomini Creeks, Va.: For maintenance, \$32,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is entirely a new item, and I should like to have the Senator explain just why it has been inserted in the bill at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that the necessity for it has developed since the bill was considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and acted upon there. The Chief of Engineers finds that there will be work required to maintain these projects, and this appropriation is based upon the very latest data which he has in his office. He recommended to the committee that those projects be taken care of in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there any unexpended balance for that purpose now, does the Senator know?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there are some unexpended balances, but they are inadequate. There is no balance to the credit of the Anacostia River, but there are unexpended balances to the credit of the Potomac River at Alexandria, Occoquan Creek, and the Rappahannock, although the Rappahannock is not included in this item. There are a few small balances; but the engineers say that they are not sufficient to maintain the projects listed in this amendment, and that it will be necessary to make this appropriation in order properly to maintain them.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say, Mr. President, that if it is possible to eliminate from the bill any new items of this kind I sincerely hope the Senator will do so for several reasons. Among others, I have just come from a meeting at which it was announced that another appropriation of at least \$750,000,000 will have to be provided for between now and the close of this session of Congress. I do not want to go into the details of that proposed appropriation now, but these vast amounts are piling up on us very rapidly. I know that \$32,000 is a small amount; but when I stop to think that within the last three weeks it has developed that we must provide \$2,000,000,000 over and above what was anticipated two months ago, it alarms me. I left that meeting to-day knowing, as I have said, that \$750,000,000 more must be appropriated and that we can not get along without it, for we must pay our debts. When that appropriation comes here I shall feel bound to support it, because it is to pay obligations which the Government entered into when we were fighting for our very existence; and, so far as I am concerned, I must vote for it, notwithstanding I know that our total appropriations are going to be so vast that the human mind can hardly comprehend them.

Thirty-two thousand dollars, I repeat, is a mere speck, but small appropriations multiply so rapidly that we have \$100,000 appropriated before we know it. From that the amount jumps to \$1,000,000; then to \$10,000,000; then to \$100,000,000; and after a while we find ourselves appropriating another \$1,000,000,000.

I do not say this in a spirit of faultfinding at all; I say it in the spirit of a Senator who is trying to call the attention of the people of the country to the fact that the obligations they will have to meet will be burdensome indeed, and every man, every woman, and every business in the United States from now on should recognize that in order to meet these obligations they must economize in every way possible. When we see projects added here that could perhaps be postponed for a year, or possibly two years, it would be wisdom, as I look at it, to put them off until we can get a breathing spell, until we can meet the great burdens that are upon us now, and will be upon us for the next year particularly—not that there will not be burdens thereafter, not that we shall not have to pay heavy taxes, for we shall have to pay them for years to come, and our children, and perhaps our children's children, will be paying taxes in order to meet the obligations that the Government is under to-day.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I think we ought to pay the closest attention to all items. So far as I am concerned, I care not what bills are introduced or what Senator introduces them, or what State is to receive the money, or where the benefits are to fall, I think they all ought to be given the closest scrutiny. Let us from now on say, as a unit on both sides of this Chamber, that we are going to stop everything that is not absolutely necessary in order to maintain our Government and keep the wheels of industry going. We will see, of course, that those who are suffering through the war and through the effects of war are taken the best care of possible, but I know that we must sooner or later cease appropriating money out of the Treasury without regard to how it is going to be raised.

I am not going to ask for a vote upon this amendment. If the Senator thinks it is absolutely necessary and will so state to the Senate, I have not another word to say upon it. I know the Senator from Florida is a good legislator; he is a sound-thinking man. I never in my life saw him go off on a tangent. He is a conservative man, and I have faith that he is not going to undertake at this time to load this bill with unnecessary items. Therefore I ask if this provision can not be eliminated just as well as not and go over to another year.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the bill has been considered by the Commerce Committee precisely along the line of the views announced by him with reference to the importance of economizing to the limit and saving every item that we could reasonably save and at the same time keep up the necessary public works. This is an item for maintenance of these projects—the Potomac River at Washington, D. C.; at Alexandria, Va., and Lower Cedar Point, Md.; Anacostia River, D. C.; Occoquan, Aquia, Upper Machodoc, and Nomini Creeks, Va. All of these are improved projects which



it is necessary to maintain. There is a small balance to the credit of the whole group. Some of them have none at all. Occoquan and Aquia Creeks have no balance at all to their credit. This appropriation covers the period from next June to June 30, 1920, and unless we provide for them they are likely to go to pieces and depreciate so materially that the money we have spent on them heretofore will be almost wasted. The engineer has stated that it is necessary to have this amount in order to maintain these projects and save the money we have already put in them and keep them useful for commercial purposes. We have limited it to the last dollar, I think, if the Senator will allow me to say so, in this item. Of course, if it is not all absolutely necessary—and they are not going to do any work that is not needed—it will remain in the Treasury; we will not spend it. But upon the advice of the engineers I must say to the Senator that I feel conscientiously that we would make a serious mistake to strike out that item, and I hope the Senator will allow it to remain.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize that where we have rivers and inlets that have taken a great deal of money from the Public Treasury to complete or improve them it would be unwise in many cases to let them go uncared for. The Senator is perfectly right in stating that if the project is not completed and there is no money for maintenance, then there ought to be an appropriation for that purpose. The only question then is as to how much it should be. The Senator himself feels positive that this \$32,000 is necessary for that purpose, and I shall not object any further to the item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 8, before the word "improvement," to strike out "Completing" and insert "For maintenance, \$2,000; for"; and, in line 11, after "\$25,000," to insert "; in all, \$27,000," so as to make the clause read:

James, Nansemond, Pagan, and Appomattox Rivers, Va.: For maintenance, \$2,000; for improvement of Pagan River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 591, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$25,000; in all, \$27,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, before the word "improvement," to strike out "Completing" and insert "For maintenance, \$2,000; for"; and, in line 22, after "\$5,000," to insert "; in all, \$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

Blackwater River, Va.; Meherrin and Roanoke Rivers and Newbegun Creek, N. C.: For maintenance, \$2,000; for improvement of Newbegun Creek in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 24, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$5,000; in all, \$7,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask that this item, beginning on page 9, lines 17 to 22, may go over temporarily? I understand that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] wants to speak upon Newbegun Creek. He notified me to that effect just before he went away, and I ask to have it passed over temporarily.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; I ask that the item between lines 17 and 22 be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the item will be temporarily passed over. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 3, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for," so as to make the clause read:

Manteo Bay, Scuppernong, Pamlico, Tar, South, Bay, Neuse, and Trent Rivers, Fishing, Contentnea, Swift, and Smith Creeks, and waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.: For maintenance, \$7,500; for improvement of Scuppernong River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1196, Sixty-second Congress, third session, \$31,800; in all, \$39,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for"; in line 18, after the words "second session," to strike out "\$5,200" and insert "\$9,000"; and, in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$45,600" and insert "\$49,400," so as to make the clause read:

Beaufort and Morehead City Harbors, Beaufort Inlet, waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, and inland waterway, Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.: For maintenance, \$24,500; for improvement of Beaufort Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1108, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$15,900; completing improvement of channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, N. C., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1125, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$9,000; in all, \$49,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 1, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "for," so as to make the clause read:

Northeast, Black, and Cape Fear Rivers, N. C.: For maintenance and continuing improvement of Cape Fear River below Wilmington in accordance with the existing project and in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 746, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, \$498,625; continuing improvement of Cape Fear River above Wilmington, \$51,000; for improvement of Northeast River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1356, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$25,375; in all, \$575,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 9, after the words "first session," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$28,000," so as to make the clause read:

Waterway between Charleston and Winyah Bay, S. C.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 178, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$28,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before reaching the next item I wish to say just a word about the appropriation for Savannah Harbor.

This appropriation is about one-half the usual appropriation. The situation is this: There is an amount unexpended from past appropriations which in the judgment of the engineering department justifies the reduction of the appropriation this year. I do not complain of this action. They do not believe that profitably there can be used more than the amount they will have unexpended of the past appropriation and this appropriation; but I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the reason why there is an unused appropriation. It is not that the appropriation was too large before, but in part from the lack of an efficient engineer in charge, and in part from the lack of a seagoing dredge, the harbor did not receive proper attention. The appropriation was not used, and work required was not done. During the past 18 months the channel across the bar has filled up nearly 2 feet, and there has been a substantial injury to the harbor in other ways. A new engineer is now in charge, and he is doing very efficient work, and the Engineering Board have recommended, in connection with the Brunswick appropriation, a sum for the acquirement of a dredge to be used in the Savannah district.

In this connection I will call the attention of the Senate to the amount of commerce passing through the Savannah Harbor—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that subject, may I ask him a question? Does the Senator know what amount of this appropriation of \$260,000 is to be used in improvement and how much for maintenance?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not give the exact figures. They will use as much as they find necessary for maintenance.

Mr. SMOOT. I judge, from what the Senator says, that the greater part of it will be used to remove from the bar the 2 feet that they have allowed to drift in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A large part of it will be required for maintenance, and for lack of proper attention during the past 18 months maintenance will cost more than a normal amount.

Mr. SMOOT. So that is only a striking evidence of what was stated just a few moments ago—that to allow these projects to run on without maintenance is the very height of extravagance.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a lack of business judgment. I do not attribute this failure to lack of judgment by the engineers here in general charge, because they manifested the greatest interest to have the harbor kept in proper condition. The local engineer was not a man fitted to meet the difficulties that surrounded him during the past year. He had trouble with labor. He stopped a number of times the operation of the dredge that he had because of disputes with labor. He did not have a first-class dredge. As a consequence the harbor was not properly maintained.

What I wish to do now is to call the attention of the Senate to the importance of this harbor, and let it be a part of the RECORD. To be perfectly candid, I was surprised myself to find that for a number of years past the seagoing commerce of Savannah has been larger than that of any harbor on the Atlantic coast except New York City.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator refer to Savannah Harbor?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I am speaking of Savannah Harbor. I wish to call attention to the exact figures, as I think it an interesting and valuable matter for the Senate to know. I wish the RECORD to show what appropriations to the Savannah Harbor mean to the commerce of the country. I present the facts to distinguish appropriations to this harbor



from the criticism, with which I have had sympathy, placed upon work of no national value.

This harbor in 1884 had a seagoing commerce of \$51,630,518. In 1917 it had a seagoing commerce of \$478,215,950. It is second only to New York City on the Atlantic coast. From 1884 to 1904 the percentage of gain of commerce out of Savannah Harbor was 170, as against 92 per cent for Baltimore, 95½ for Philadelphia, 53½ for New York, and 41½ for Boston. From 1904 to 1914 the Savannah increase was much larger than that of any other point upon the Atlantic coast. From 1884 to 1914 Savannah's gain was 454 per cent, New York's was 162 per cent, Baltimore's was 154 per cent, Philadelphia's was 78 per cent, and Boston's was 3½ per cent.

Again, the foreign exports from Savannah for 1914 were \$110,594,981; those from New York were \$864,546,338; Baltimore, \$109,690,231; Boston and Charlestown, Mass., \$65,715,181; Philadelphia, \$65,182,514; Norfolk, \$25,625,255; Wilmington, N. C., \$25,870,851; Charleston, S. C., \$20,829,302. So that in 1914 the foreign exports from Savannah were larger than those of any other port upon the Atlantic coast except New York.

Turning to the Gulf, New Orleans had \$193,839,961 in 1914, against Savannah's \$110,594,981.

The water-borne commerce through the port of Savannah for the year 1914 was \$349,193,325; New Orleans, \$311,557,861; Boston, \$241,288,667.

I give next the commerce through the port of Savannah from 1910 to 1917, inclusive. It began at \$224,000,000 in 1910, and in 1917 it was \$478,000,000.

I then give a comparison with the other cities, and I show that during the average of that period the commerce through the port of Savannah exceeded that of any other city upon the Atlantic coast, except New York, and exceeded even that of New Orleans, on the Gulf coast.

Mr. KENYON. What is the population of Savannah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. About 125,000, I think. I give these figures, Mr. President, and I ask the privilege of putting the exact figures in the RECORD, because when the subject of this port comes up, as it will next year, again, I want the foundation laid by having the Senate realize the importance of its commerce to the commerce of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., February 6, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Our business interests are deeply concerned over the utter inadequacy of the appropriations made for the proper maintenance of this river and harbor.

Savannah naturally is ambitious to play its part in the great era of trade expansion that we all look forward to. Our business interests are progressive and have widespread international connections that justify the hope that in the years just ahead there will be a vastly greater volume of commerce passing in and out of this harbor.

Arrangements are making for an extension of our commercial connections with South America, Central America, and the West Indies. Our trade with European countries, as you are doubtless fully aware, had a wonderful development in the years immediately preceding the war. There is also reason to believe that Asiatic connections will come, bringing a direct movement of southern raw and manufactured products through this doorway.

We will be handicapped and the interests not only of Savannah but of all Georgia and of other Southern States will be adversely affected if the Savannah Harbor is not properly protected and promoted.

We look to you to take care of our interests at this time when it is essential that we have a strong friend in Congress. The business interests here are your friends, and we appeal to you as friends as well as Georgians and representatives of great commercial affairs to use your influence to correct what we regard as a manifest injustice.

Requesting your most earnest support in this important matter, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

MURRAY STEWART, Mayor.

#### RECAPITULATION.

	Expenditures on harbor.	Controlling depth of harbor at mean low water.	Commerce for calendar year.	Remarks.
From 1874 to June 30, 1885.....	\$831,614.40	1885: 13 to 14 feet.....	1884: \$51,630,518.....	Value of commerce, 1884, in proportion to \$1 expenditures from 1874 to 1885..... \$62.00
From 1885 to June 30, 1905.....	6,569,323.22	1905: 19 feet.....	1904: \$193,820,760.....	Value of commerce, 1904, in proportion to \$1 expenditures from 1885 to 1905..... 29.50
From 1905 to June 30, 1912.....	1,968,639.20	1912: 22 feet.....	1911: \$246,678,077.....	Value of commerce, 1911, in proportion to \$1 expenditures from 1905 to 1912..... 125.00
From 1912 to June 30, 1916.....	1,258,663.28	1916: 22 feet.....	1915: \$420,088,304.....	Value of commerce, 1915, in proportion to \$1 expenditures from 1912 to 1916..... 334.00
From 1916 to June 30, 1918.....	10,628,240.10 ( <sup>1</sup> )	1918: 22 to 23 feet.....	1917: \$478,215,950.....	

<sup>1</sup> Figures in hands of Chief of Engineers—unable to obtain in Savannah.

With a total expenditure of \$10,628,240.10 to June 30, 1916, on the Savannah Harbor, the water-borne commerce of this port for 1915 shows an increase over the calendar year 1884—713.6 per cent.

Controlling depth of harbor for 1917 remains practically the same as of 1916, but there has been an advance in the general depth of the harbor.

#### Comparison of foreign exports with the leading ports of the Atlantic coast.

	Per cent.
1884 to 1904, inclusive:	
Savannah.....	gain..... 170
New York.....	do..... 53½
Boston.....	do..... 41½
Baltimore.....	do..... 92
Philadelphia.....	do..... 95½
1904 to 1914, inclusive:	
Savannah.....	do..... 105½
New York.....	do..... 70½

#### 1904 to 1914, inclusive—Continued.

	Per cent.
Boston.....	loss..... 26½
Baltimore.....	gain..... 32½
Philadelphia.....	loss..... 8½

#### RECAPITULATION.

1884 to 1914, inclusive:	
Savannah.....	gain..... 454½
New York.....	do..... 162½
Boston.....	do..... 3½
Baltimore.....	do..... 154½
Philadelphia.....	do..... 78½

#### Rank of principal ports of the United States in foreign exports of domestic and foreign merchandise.

	1910	1912	Revised custom districts.	1914
Atlantic coast:				
New York.....	\$651,986,356	\$817,945,803	New York (N. Y.).....	\$864,546,338
Savannah.....	63,428,155	104,236,925	Savannah (Ga.).....	110,594,981
Baltimore.....	77,381,507	92,210,877	Baltimore (Md.).....	109,690,231
Boston and Charlestown.....	70,516,789	69,692,171	Boston and Charlestown (Mass.).....	65,715,181
Philadelphia.....	73,269,343	69,069,730	Philadelphia (Pa.).....	65,182,514
Norfolk.....	8,155,818	11,998,504	Norfolk (Va.).....	25,625,255
Wilmington.....	20,922,398	28,705,448	Wilmington (N. C.).....	25,870,851
Charleston.....	8,104,821	12,423,035	Charleston (S. C.).....	20,829,302
Jacksonville.....	2,391,090	2,329,322	(Changed to Tampa, Fla.).....	
Gulf coast:				
Tampa.....	4,395,972	4,409,640	Tampa (Fla.).....	41,838,924
Mobile.....	27,526,245	31,230,117	Mobile (Ala.).....	50,805,641
New Orleans.....	140,376,560	149,160,910	New Orleans (New Orleans).....	193,839,961
Galveston.....	173,178,992	218,146,097	Galveston (Galveston).....	255,767,603
Pacific coast:				
San Francisco.....	31,180,760	49,249,734	San Francisco (San Francisco).....	63,374,900



*Comparative statement of water-borne commerce through the port of Savannah for the year 1914.*

Savannah	\$349,193,325
New Orleans	311,557,861
Boston	241,288,667
Wilmington	\$28,682,163
Charleston	46,800,741
Brunswick	38,373,320
Jacksonville	60,718,452
Fernandina	9,230,082
Tampa	46,034,985
Pensacola	22,819,119
Mobile	58,085,903
	310,744,765

*Water-borne commerce through the port of Savannah for the following calendar years.*

1910	\$224,512,440
1911	246,678,077
1912	296,444,106
1913	360,536,275
1914	349,193,325
1915	420,088,304
1916	383,225,968
1917	478,215,950

*Comparative statement of valuation of water-borne commerce through the port of Savannah for the years 1913 and 1915.*

	Year 1913.	Year 1915.
Savannah, Ga.	\$360,536,275	\$420,088,304
New Orleans, La.	315,082,532	368,522,285
Boston, Mass.	208,824,704	296,195,076
Wilmington, N. C.	46,736,713	46,638,404
Charleston, S. C.	79,225,772	57,394,658
Brunswick, Ga.	58,258,725	44,675,521
Jacksonville, Fla.	71,244,326	61,022,944
Fernandina, Fla.	9,697,281	2,732,197
Tampa, Fla.	50,480,000	44,319,230
Pensacola, Fla.	36,573,434	23,095,884
Mobile, Ala.	61,368,688	46,440,771
	413,584,939	326,319,609

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The Secretary proceeded to state the next amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Page	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Polindexter	Smoot
Colt	Kendrick	Pomerene	Sutherland
Culberson	Kenyon	Ransdell	Swanson
Fletcher	Kirby	Reed	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Robinson	Townsend
Gore	Lewis	Saulsbury	Trammell
Hale	McCumber	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Harding	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh
Henderson	Moses	Sherman	Warren
Hitchcock	New	Smith, Ariz.	Watson
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smith, Mich.	Wolcott

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is detained by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I should like to return to page 6 while the matter is fresh. I have just telephoned Gen. Taylor respecting the item of \$20,000, in line 7, for maintenance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted to return to the item mentioned by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The engineers report that there has been very little maintenance on these two projects for the last year or two, and that the entire amount to the credit of those projects now will be used up during this spring and summer; and that unless they can have this amount of \$20,000 they will not be able to give proper consideration to those projects after next summer, say July or August of this year—they refer mainly to the Cooper and Salem Rivers and Raccoon Creek—and that there is no mistake in our reporting it at \$20,000. That was the amount which was recommended, and it is based on a report received from the district engineer on January 8. Recently, since the bill passed the House, the district engineer reports that he will require that amount for maintenance of those projects until July, 1920; so I ask that that item be agreed to as reported in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, myself, that if the item is actually required for maintenance, it ought to be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the item recurred to will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then, the total will be made \$59,770 to correspond to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The total, without objection, will be changed to correspond to the amendment. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$23,000"; in line 18, before the word "improvement," to strike out "completing" and insert "\$50,000; completing improvement of Generals Cut, Ga., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 581, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$1,000; for"; and, in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$28,000" and insert "\$56,000," so as to make the clause read:

Waterway between Beaufort, S. C., and St. Johns River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$50,000; completing improvement of Generals Cut, Ga., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 581, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$1,000; for improvement of Back River, Ga., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1391, Sixty-second Congress, third session, \$5,000; in all \$56,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this \$50,000 is for maintenance only, is it?

Mr. FLETCHER. For maintenance of these waterways, yes; between Beaufort, S. C., and the St. Johns River, Fla. It is the intracoastal waterway from Beaufort, S. C., to St. Johns River, Fla. The increase is due to the recommendation of the engineers that \$23,000 would not be sufficient to maintain that waterway until July, 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. But it is an increase of over 100 per cent; and I wondered why the House only allowed \$23,000, and then they immediately came to the Senate and had it increased over 100 per cent.

Mr. FLETCHER. The House estimate was not based upon the very latest information, and later data received by the Engineer office show that they need that amount, \$50,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, after the words "first session," to strike out "\$240,000" and insert "\$500,000," so as to read:

Brunswick Harbor, Ga.: For maintenance, \$30,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 393, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$500,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia said that he was going to make some explanation of this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of the bill understands this matter perhaps even better than I do, because it has been done by recommendation of the Engineering Department; but I understand that it includes the purchase of a dredge for the entire Savannah district.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have the document here. That is with reference to Brunswick Harbor, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. House Document No. 393.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And that dredge is to be used in both of the harbors or in the entire district.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is for the purpose of completing the project if the project itself is adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is wrong; it is for maintenance.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it is not for the purpose of completing it. It is for the dredge; that is right. It is to build a dredge, and it was estimated that it would cost that amount. They needed a dredge there; they had to have a particular kind of a dredge to do that work, and it was necessary to raise the appropriation for the purpose of providing that dredge.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that Gen. Taylor told us that there were no private companies that had a dredge that could do just that kind of work, and it would be necessary to have a dredge constructed for that work, which he regarded as very important. In many of the works private companies can do the work just as well as the Government, and we have a general clause permitting them to bid on all the work; but at that particular place he said that there was no chance to get the work done by a private company, and he wanted authority to construct the dredge.

Mr. SMOOT. What particular conditions are there that require a special dredge there?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They need a seagoing dredge.

Mr. RANSDELL. It is out adjoining the ocean, very similar to the work at New York Harbor and at the mouth of the Mississippi River, where the Government has its own dredges, but they have no dredge that they can send to that point. All of their deep-sea dredges, he said, were in use, and they would



need one for that work. They did not know of any place from which they could transfer a dredge to do that work.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I called up Gen. Taylor and had a talk with him after the report of the committee was made. I understand the situation is this. The real damage in this harbor has been due to the fill of the bar. There is a channel out through the bar from both these harbors. I have a map of Brunswick Harbor here. The lack of furnishing a seagoing dredge has caused in the last two years the Government work on this channel to fill in nearly 2 feet. The same is true of Savannah Harbor.

Let me say in reference to Brunswick Harbor that in many respects it is the greatest harbor on the Atlantic coast. It is landlocked by St. Simon and Jekyll Islands; it has an area of 31 square miles; it has a thousand acres with depth of from 30 to 80 feet in the channel. The Government owns Blythe Island, bought in 1857 for the purpose of locating a naval station. It has simply not received the attention that its great value to the country deserves.

In the past two years there have been erected in Brunswick plants with investments of \$20,000,000. The business has enormously increased. I have here a statement from the secretary of the board of trade giving a list of new plants that have very recently been built there. The Government put up one plant. The Atlantic Refining Company put up an enormous refinery there. The port will be used to a greater extent for that reason by vessels going toward the Panama Canal and South America.

This increase, Gen. Taylor told me, is in part to provide a seagoing dredge for the use not only of Brunswick, but equally of Savannah.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know what is the depth of that channel?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The average at average low water is about 24 feet.

Mr. SMOOT. About 24 feet?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. About 24 feet, and 7½ more feet at high water. The project involves, with no great expense, adding 4 feet more depth to it. I dislike to give the figures, for I might be wrong, but there is to be with that additional 4 feet a depth to float any of our big naval vessels.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the depth was 22 feet in June, 1917.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There was a fill of 2 feet at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, it had been 24 feet?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It had been 24 feet, and it was to have been carried to 30 feet. That was the project, but the lack of a seagoing dredge allowed the fill of 2 feet.

I wish to add that there is one great feature of Brunswick Harbor. It is not a harbor into which waste from the soil flows. It is an inlet from the sea and scarcely anything comes to it to fill it up. It is one of the most economical harbors to maintain that can be found anywhere for that reason.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a tide of about 7 feet, does the Senator say?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The tide is from 6.8 to 7.6 feet.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a very important harbor, and it is growing in importance all the while. There are no dredges available to do that work. The Government itself has not the necessary dredge. In fact, the Chief of Engineers reported to our committee that there is need for 20 new dredges in his department. But we have not provided for those. In this case it is necessary to provide for the dredge in order to have the work done.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know what the dredge will cost. The balance, of course, would be the amount to be expended in improvements.

Mr. FLETCHER. It would be the difference between \$240,000 and \$500,000; that is, \$260,000 for a seagoing dredge. It is very much needed by the department, not only in connection with this work but other work.

Mr. SMOOT. I am glad to see that there is a great deal of commerce in and about that harbor. I think there were 1,009,026 short tons, valued at \$28,258,725.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is now very much more than that.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will just wait, I will state that that was the effect of the first improvement.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I am always in favor of spending money upon projects where there is a commerce connected with them. What I object to is spending money upon projects where there is no commerce to-day and no likelihood that there ever will be sufficient commerce to justify the appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That commerce, as a result of this work, has increased 5,000 per cent up to \$56,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that on a project of that kind it is worth spending public money.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the last three years capitalists have invested in plants in Brunswick to the amount of \$18,150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to congratulate the Senator from Georgia and also the people of Georgia upon that fact. I was surprised to hear the Senator say that the commerce of Savannah Harbor is as great as it is. In fact, I had no idea that it was greater than that of Boston Harbor until the Senator called my attention to it to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was surprised, too.

THE BOARD OF TRADE,  
Brunswick, Ga., January 28, 1919.

HON. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Your letter of January 21 to Mr. R. L. Phillips, president of the board of trade, has just been referred to me by Mr. Phillips, who was out of the city for the past 10 days.

I am sorry your request for a map of Brunswick Harbor, showing width of channel and depths all over the bar, did not reach me sooner.

I am sending you herewith copy of Coast Survey Chart No. 447, which shows the depths at all points in the harbor, and on which the local Army Engineer office has outlined the anchorage areas that have depths of 30 feet at mean low water, or 37 feet at mean high water. The channel widths are also shown thereon. You will note from this that, with the exception of the shoal spots at Brunswick Point and in upper and lower Turtle River, the only obstacle preventing the use of the harbor by vessels of the deepest draft afloat is the controlling depths on Brunswick bar. The fact that the greater part of Brunswick inner harbor runs from 30 feet deep at mean low water to as much as 87 feet deep at mean low water should prove conclusively the economy with which the harbor can be deepened to make it available at low water for any ship in the world. Its large area of deep-water anchorage makes it a logical port for such improvements.

We have also indicated on the chart the location of the shipbuilding plants, the United States picric-acid plant, and the site upon which the Atlantic Refining Co. is now building their \$5,000,000 oil refinery and half mile of permanent docks, over which they will receive the crude oil from tankers, and at which they will be able to fuel a practically unlimited number of steamers at one time. The availability of these fuel-oil facilities, both for merchant ships and the Navy, will be regulated solely by the controlling depth of water available between the open sea and the docks, and to make these facilities of the greatest value to the Nation a project should be adopted at once, as has been done already by the War and Navy Departments at Charleston, to provide a minimum channel 40 feet deep at mean low water, and not less than 1,000 feet wide. A channel of this depth would make available for use by the Navy not only these fuel facilities, but also the navy-yard site on Blythe Island, owned by the Government, and unused, since 1857, and the natural anchorage areas, in which a great fleet could ride safely at anchor without obstructing the channel.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,  
Very truly, yours,

A. M. SMITH,  
Managing Secretary.

THE BOARD OF TRADE,  
Brunswick, Ga., February 4, 1919.

HON. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your wire, reading as follows, received: "Mail me at once figures on your growth during the last two years, naming new plants." In answer, I am giving you below a list of the old plants and the new plants here:

Old plants:	Cost.
Yaryan Rosin & Turpentine Co.....	\$1,000,000
Georgia Veneer & Package Co.....	250,000
Georgia Creosoting Co.....	200,000
Savannah River Lumber Co.....	100,000
Lang & Orr (planing mill).....	50,000
Sea Food Co. (canning plant).....	40,000
Brunswick Canning Co. (Ltd.).....	60,000
Glynn Canning Co.....	75,000
	<hr/>
	1,775,000

New plants (added in last two years):	
Government picric acid plant.....	9,500,000
Atlantic Refining Co. (refinery and fuel oil).....	5,000,000
Brunswick Marine Construction Corporation.....	300,000
Liberty Shipbuilding Co.....	50,000
United States Maritime Corporation.....	250,000
American Shipbuilding Co.....	350,000
Brunswick Shell Products Co.....	25,000
Brunswick Machine Co.....	25,000
Brunswick Shipbuilding Co.....	75,000
The Foundation Co.-Carpenter-Watkins (Inc.).....	200,000
Trant Lumber Co.....	50,000
Georgia Rosin Products Co.....	50,000
Brunswick Cross-Arm Co.....	25,000
United States Government naval air station.....	2,000,000
Glynn Compress Co.....	50,000
Georgia Cotton Co.....	50,000
Glynn Ice Co. (new ice and cold-storage plant).....	150,000

Total new industries..... 18,150,000

The total bank deposits for the year 1915 were \$1,221,000; for 1916, \$1,718,000; for 1917, \$2,261,000; and for 1918, \$4,118,000.

The pay rolls per week for 1915 were \$33,000; for 1916, \$44,000; for 1917, \$63,000; and for 1918, \$390,000. These figures were obtained from the three banks here in November, 1918.



If there is any further information that you desire along this line, please wire or write us and we shall be glad to send it to you promptly.  
Yours, very truly,

A. M. SMITH,  
Managing Secretary.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 25.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will not the Senator let us vote on this amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well, if I shall be recognized afterwards.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make a point of order against the motion of the Senator from Iowa. There is a motion pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is upon the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the Secretary proceed with the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, line 2, in the total for Brunswick Harbor, Ga., strike out "\$270,000" and insert "\$530,000."

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of resolution No. 25.

Mr. President, this resolution relates to legislation or the preparation for legislation made necessary by the war through which we have just passed.

I regret very much that I feel it to be my duty to bring the subject before the Senate at this time and in that way to defer, not to defeat, the appropriation bill which is under consideration. But from my standpoint this resolution and the subjects which are involved in it are of infinitely greater importance than any appropriation bill that has been brought before the Senate or that is likely to be brought before this body.

The appropriation bills will be passed. The operations of the Government will not be suspended. We all understand perfectly well that these appropriation bills must be and will be adopted in some form. But unless I can get consideration for this resolution at this time it is not likely that the House will come into possession of it in time to pass upon it or to consider it before this session has closed. It is of the very first importance, Mr. President, that this resolution, if it meets the favor of Congress, shall be considered at this session.

The opportunity to accomplish the thing which we desire to accomplish through the resolution is passing day after day. It can not be as effective as though it had been adopted a month ago, and every hour that intervenes without the action of Congress upon the subject will allow some important vital situation to pass unimproved.

These are my reasons, Mr. President, for bringing it before the Senate at this time, and I sincerely hope that it can be disposed of by the Senate so that no serious delay will occur in the consideration of the river and harbor bill. If I have to choose between the passage of the river and harbor bill and the passage of this resolution, I unhesitatingly select the latter for my preference.

The resolution, Mr. President, is substantially as follows: It provides for the creation of six joint congressional committees on reconstruction. Each of those committees is to be composed of five Senators and five Representatives in Congress. They are to be selected in the manner in which the standing committees of each House are selected, and they are to change from time to time as the standing committees are changed.

I quote, then, the next paragraph of the resolution:

The said committees shall make, respectively, investigations of the subjects hereinafter named and herein assigned to them, respectively, and shall report to Congress from time to time with such recommendations as to additional legislation, or otherwise, as they, respectively, may deem advisable.

The first committee, which shall be known as the joint congressional committee upon the demobilization of the Army and Navy, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

I especially call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the scope of the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Do I understand the Senator from Florida rises to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not opposing particularly the Senator's resolution, but I insist that it is not in order now, because we are considering this bill under a unanimous-consent agreement to take up the committee amendments to the bill in the order which they come, and the pending question now before the Senate is the amendments of the committee offered to this bill,

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order. The Chair thinks that under Rule XXII the pending question is the committee amendment, and the motion of the Senator from Iowa is not in order. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Chair rule that until this bill is disposed of there can be no change in the proceedings of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly not. The Chair simply rules that the pending question is the committee amendment which the Secretary has reported, and that under the rules of the Senate it is out of order to make the motion which the Senator from Iowa has proposed.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the Secretary read the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states to the Senator from Utah that the amendment has been read.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood that the amendment with reference to Brunswick Harbor had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to and another amendment has been read.

Mr. SMOOT. What other amendment was read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment again.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, line 2, strike out "\$270,000" and insert "\$530,000."

Mr. SMOOT. That is only changing the total, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment and it has been read.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the Secretary read it after the other was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection to a vote on this amendment, but I hope the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] will not feel that there will be no opportunity for me to bring forward this resolution. I intend to bring it forward at some time and take the judgment of the Senate upon it. If I can not do it otherwise than through speaking upon it, either upon this amendment or upon some other, I shall pursue that course in obedience to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am standing by the rule of the Senate. There is a bill here that ought to be completed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall discontinue my remarks until this amendment is voted upon. Then I shall seek the recognition of the Chair for the motion I desire to make.

Mr. FLETCHER. The point of order, in my judgment, is good against this proposal or against any other proposal of this kind until these amendments are acted on, because under the unanimous consent of the Senate the formal reading of the bill was dispensed with and the Senate committee amendments were to be taken up and considered first. The committee amendments are here to be acted upon. I am not delaying the Senator. If we go on and act on these amendments, the Senator will have time to offer his resolution for consideration. I am not opposing his resolution, but there is a bill here in my charge, and it is my duty to keep the bill before the Senate and have it disposed of.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not questioning the sincerity of the Senator from Florida or his conception of his duty. I hope the Senator will pursue the course which he thinks best. I shall endeavor to get this resolution before the Senate just as soon as I can.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to see this bill put through, but I desire to say that if the contention of the Senator in charge of the bill is correct there will never be another unanimous consent on an appropriation bill that the committee amendments shall be considered first. That is not my understanding nor was it ever contemplated by me that an agreement of that kind would shut out action of every other kind and require the consideration of the amendments of the committee before anything else could come up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no point of order pending. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has the floor and is entitled to address the Senate. The Chair sustained the point of order made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not desire to address the Senate on the amendment which the Chair has said is pending, but I hope to get the floor immediately after that is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.



## JOINT COMMITTEES ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 25.

As I was remarking a few moments ago with regard to the character of the resolution, the first joint congressional committee is upon the demobilization of the Army and Navy, and it is required to investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

(a) The employment of discharged soldiers and sailors in civil pursuits.

(b) The allotment of lands to returned soldiers and sailors and their establishment in homes upon the public domain.

(c) All legislation which may be required in the proper care for those who have suffered the dangers of war, and especially those who have been disabled and whose ability to earn a livelihood has been impaired.

Mr. President, is there anything more important than to enact the legislation which ought to attend the demobilization of our Army and our Navy? Confessedly our legislation is both inadequate and imperfect. The highest duty of the American people at this time is to see that the men who have offered their lives in defense of their country shall be properly cared for as they return, either in health or in sickness, to their homes and to their communities. I do not remember just how many have been wounded during the war in France, but, as I remember, nearly 50,000 have fallen and 200,000 have suffered some disability in the defense of their country.

What shall we do with these soldiers, incapable as they are of earning a livelihood, without the means to enter upon any business which they are qualified to pursue, and when even though they come home safe and sound they find themselves not only deprived of the profits of the employment in which they were formerly engaged, but they find themselves without the opportunity to reenter those employments.

If there is one thing more than another which ought to engage the patriotic heart and ought to command universal interest it is some legislation, some provision with regard to these men, who have done more than you or I have done. We may have performed our duty as we have understood our duty, but it was a duty unaccompanied with danger. They have performed their duties in the midst of the most terrific struggle which ever devastated the earth, and it is for us now to see that as they return to their homes they are so provided that they will not suffer in the transition of war to peace.

I do not believe there is a single committee now engaged in the especial duty or work of devising the legislation which will make this transition either tolerable or safe. I do not think that there is any one committee that has in charge the legislation of which I speak.

I do not want by the organization of standing committees composed of Members of the House and Senate to dispossess the committees of either the Senate or the House of the jurisdiction which they are now exercising. I want these committees to go forward with all the speed possible and do the most effectual work they can do. But this is imperative work. There is need for immediate concurrence between the House and the Senate respecting any legislation that we may approve. If we work separately we will neither work as effectively nor will we accomplish the end so speedily as though we were to create joint committees, who would act in a sense as conference committees. We will save months in point of time, aside from utilizing the combined wisdom of both branches of Congress in the preparation and the passage of legislation with the object which I have set forth.

I do not intend to lay before the Senate my own views about the legislation which should be had. I would instantly create controversy if I were to do so. It is that very controversy among Members of Congress which makes legislation of this character difficult to pass. It is difficult to come to an agreement with regard to it, and from that fact arises the necessity of joint committees, if we intend to do anything within the time in which we must do it, if we are to afford the relief, which is imperative from my standpoint. If we allow six months to pass or a year to pass, these men will have suffered all they can suffer, and any remedy we may propose will be unavailing. It will have lost very largely its purpose if we permit months and months to go by without preparing a comprehensive and an effective plan for their relief.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FRANCE. Does not the Senator think that much of the unrest throughout the country, to which allusion was made this morning, is due to the neglect on the part of the national legislative bodies to deal with these very matters?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think so, Mr. President. We are drifting into the most unfortunate position in which any nation can be. I believe it to be true that a very large proportion of the soldiers who have gone abroad and have so magnificently performed their duty, not only to our own country but to civilization itself, are coming home discontented, are coming home with criticism in their hearts, and that many of those discharged from the service will come with criticism upon their lips. I can not imagine anything more depressing than to feel that the 2,000,000 men who have fought for us on the soil of France are coming to their own land not only dissatisfied with the manner in which their officers have managed and controlled them but deeply disappointed because their own country has done nothing to provide for the transition from war to peace, from military life to civil pursuits.

Is there a Senator here who doubts it? Can you doubt that if the very day after the armistice was proclaimed there had been created a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress with the especial duty of taking care of the men who are thus committed to our guardianship, and if we had entered upon that work diligently and intelligently, and this were known to the soldiers of the United States, there would have occurred the severe criticisms and the deep-seated disappointment on the part of these men you now observe?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator asks the question whether there is one Senator who doubts that statement. I am one. So far as my State is concerned I do not think there is a man returning from the Army who is not able to find plenty of work and a position open to him to go back to; and I have the impression that in Iowa, the Senator's State, he will find that the condition is very much the same.

Mr. CUMMINS. I must entirely disagree with the Senator from Nebraska. I have no doubt that a great many of these men will find labor, and that a great many of them have found labor, but a great many have not found employment, and they will not be able to find employment unless the industries of the country revive in a way which I regard as impossible, at least very improbable.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa permit a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not true that the Senator's own mail from his constituents indicates that for every man who is looking for a place he has 10 men in the Army anxious to get out, so as to take positions that are offered them?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is very little actual communication between those who have places to give and the men who are in the Army. They depend for their information in that respect upon the general sentiment of the community, the general promises which are outstanding, to reinstate men who have gone into the Army in their former places, but they can not reinstate them in their former places unless those who are now filling those places are driven from them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator does not answer my question. I want to say that, so far as my mail is concerned, there is not a day that passes that I am not urging the War Department to discharge men who have places open for them and work awaiting them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know of some such cases, but the men are begging to be discharged whether there are any places open for them or otherwise. They do not want to remain in the Army during times of peace, and they would rather face the struggle for employment than to continue in the Army. I think that is the exact situation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while I agree with very much of what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has said, and if the main agree that we ought to perhaps appoint committees or at least devote ourselves at the earliest possible moment to the present domestic problems involved, and made more pressing by the recent armistice and the transition from war to peace, replying very briefly, and in a word—

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not yield for a reply, because the rule might be applied to me rather rigidly, and I might lose my place on the floor.

Mr. KING. May I say this: Does not the Senator feel that his statement was a little too broad when he observed that the men returning from overseas—and he did not seem to make any distinction—were filled with bitterness and resentment in their hearts, and when discharged that feeling manifested itself in criticism from their lips of those who had charge of them and of



conditions generally? I have not found such a condition. I think that the men who have come from overseas feel that they did a great work for their country and for civilization and have come home like gallant men ready to meet the problems that confront them here.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no doubt they come home with the same spirit with which they fought. They intend to play their part in the drama of life, and they will do it courageously; they will do it resolutely, but it is still my observation that there is among the returning soldiers a very pronounced feeling of disappointment—sometimes resentment, and sometimes merely regret which they experience in coming home and finding that they are not to be cared for as they believed they would be.

Mr. President, what I say, of course, about the treatment of the soldiers abroad does not apply to all the officers of the Army, but I have listened to scores of them relating their grievances with regard to the manner in which they have been officered and controlled in France. Do not think that that has driven from their hearts the love of country, or the purpose to work for her and fight for her in the future, but, nevertheless, it is a very unhappy and unfortunate circumstance.

Mr. President, this, however, is a mere opening chapter to this resolution. It is put first in the resolution because it ought to be done first. It must be done now, or not at all; that is, it will not be effectively done unless it is done now. But I pass to another subject of the resolution.

The third of said committees, which shall be known as the Joint Congressional Committee on Interstate Transportation, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

- (a) The permanent relation which the Government of the United States should sustain to the common carriers of the country.
- (b) Whether the systems of transportation now in possession of and being operated by the Government should be returned to their former owners and operated as heretofore, or whether Government operation should continue with or without Government ownership; or, if private ownership is to continue and private operation resumed, what system of regulation and control will be best adapted to secure efficiency in service, reasonable rates of transportation, and fairness to the capital invested.
- (c) The relation which should be established between inland water transportation and the railways, including the control of the former.
- (d) All questions relating to communication by wire.

Mr. President, there is no greater, no more vital problem now before the American people, none that has ever been before the American people, and I am led almost to say that there never will be one more important, of vaster consequence, than the subject I have just recited. The Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate has been for a month or more holding daily sessions, inviting the views of men of thought, of men of experience, of men of judgment upon this important topic. I do not want that committee to cease; I want it to continue the work in which it is engaged; but, if we had a joint committee, composed of Members of both Houses, that could establish some relation between the consideration of this subject in the Senate and in the House, if we could be drawing more nearly together, if we could be conferring with regard to the subject, in my judgment, we would reach a conclusion months and months in advance of the time that will be required if there be entirely independent consideration and action upon the part of the two Houses.

This is the time to do that work. The public mind is alive not only to its importance, but is alive to the very difficult problems which inhere in the readjustment of the relations between the Government of the United States and the carriers of the country. There never has been a time, and I do not believe that there ever will be a time, when the public mind is so ready and so ripe, so matured for the consideration and disposition of this subject as it now is. Everybody is thinking of it. Every man who has been affected by the experience of the last year, every man who was affected by the experience of the time before Government operation—all are agreed and anxious that the United States shall, at the very first possible moment, reach a conclusion with regard to the permanent policy which shall be established between the Government and the railroads.

If we miss this opportunity, no other so good a one is likely to recur, and it seems to me that there ought to have been two months ago the closest communication and the closest relations between the two Houses in the consideration of this subject.

I mention but one other of the subjects which are touched by this resolution. It is this:

The fifth of said committees, which shall be known as the Joint Congressional Committee on Employers and Employees, shall so investigate and report upon the following matters, to wit:

- (a) Conciliation and arbitration in labor disputes.
- (b) The relation of men and women in similar employments.
- (c) Substitution of female employees for male employees, and vice versa.
- (d) The organization of permanent employment agencies.

(e) The distribution of labor, including employment of surplus labor on public works.

(f) The sanitary housing of employees and the disposition of houses constructed by the Government during the war.

(g) The freedom of labor, and of employment in its relation to trade unionism; and wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

Mr. President, if I said a few moments ago that the adjustment of the railway problem was the most important, I desire to retract that statement. That part of the resolution which I have just read is the most important of all.

The people of this country are deluding themselves in the hope that the storm which has swept over Russia, which is at its height in Germany, which is gathering in Great Britain, will not be felt in the United States. Those who indulge that hope are bound to be disappointed. Mr. President, we must face that question—the labor question—just as these other countries are facing it.

The struggle between socialism and a modified individualism agitated the world for years before the war. It received great impetus during the war. The outcome of the war was of a character to bring this issue directly before the people of the several countries engaged in the war, and we must meet calmly, intelligently, and resolutely the issue between socialism and individualism of a modified character, because none of us can hope, and none of us ought to wish, to continue individualism just as it was known before.

There is no essential difference between the Soviet government of Russia and the Ebert government of Germany, except that the former is in civil war and is led into atrocities, if you please, assassination and murder, so characterized because it is in war; but there is no essential difference. Before the war the labor movement of Europe was largely in the hands of the Socialists. The labor leaders of Russia before the war were Socialists; the labor leaders of Germany were Socialists. They led, directed, and controlled the movement in behalf of labor in those countries. The only two great commercial countries in the world in which any kind of individualism was preserved before the war in labor unions were Great Britain and the United States.

I hope I will not be understood as approving socialism as it is preached in Russia or as it is preached in Germany or as it is now being taught in Great Britain. I believe in individualism in private enterprise, but no man dare rise anywhere to condemn as unpatriotic or untrained or uneducated all the men and the women of the world who believe that socialism is the better form of industry and production. While I do not agree with the Socialists in that respect, nevertheless I know that the time is coming when I must meet that doctrine or that form of government in society, not by denunciation, not by repression, not by imprisonment, but I must meet it in the forum of reason and argument, and, if I can not prevail against it there, I go down, and I ought to go down.

The Socialist in Russia believes that all industrial activity should be conducted by the government. The Socialist in Germany believes exactly the same thing. The Socialists in Great Britain—and the principal labor leaders of Great Britain are now passing into the ranks of socialism—believe that human activity should be conducted, managed, and directed by society itself. They believe, and we all believe, that a man who will not work ought not to eat. I think that is a fundamental doctrine, whether one is an individualist or whether he is a Socialist; but we believe, those of us who still cling to the old system in a modified form, that there is no enduring progress in the world unless there are degrees in compensation or reward.

I for one believe that a worker is entitled to withdraw from that which he produces or which the aggregate produces the share proportionate to his contribution, and I know of no way in which to adjust that share save upon the basis of the world's opinion with regard to the value of the contribution. I do not care, however, to discuss the question. I only know that it is here for consideration, and it is here for decision. There is a crying demand for legislation, for consideration, and for intelligent study of the relation between labor and capital, between the varying views which are held by students with regard to the share to which the worker is entitled as compared to the share to which capital is entitled.

We ought to have a joint committee of Congress devoted to that subject, and to no other—a joint committee that can so coordinate the work of the two Houses that we will be likely, at least, to reach a conclusion upon the inquiry or upon the problem within some reasonable time. We ought to be able to say to the men who believe that they have been and that they are deprived of their honest, just share of the fruits of labor that the whole thought of the Congress in a crystallized and organized way has been turned to the subject, and that we are not unmindful of its importance, not unmindful that it is vital



to the perpetuation of the Republic and to the happiness of mankind.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. May I suggest to the Senator that, entertaining similar views to those he has expressed as to the importance of this particular question, I introduced a resolution here for a general survey of labor problems by the Committee on Education and Labor. That resolution passed the Senate, and we have had at least, I think, 25 days where the usual hours of committee meetings have been given to that subject. The hearings have been intensely interesting, and out of them have come for consideration certain bills that we felt might help the labor situation.

I wish to say to the Senator that at the time Mr. Gompers testified I think we had possibly six members of the committee present. During the remainder of the time, I am safe in saying, we never have had over five present, most of the time not over three, and some of the time only two, the average being about three. The effort to do something along that line was met with the proposition that the way to handle this question was to radiate a cheerful optimism, and that any attempt to investigate these questions tended to excite unrest and Bolshevism in the country. I have come to the conclusion that, so far as the Senate is concerned, it does not feel that there is any necessity of doing anything on that subject. I hope, and I believe, that when the President of the United States returns—and it seems that the only way to secure any action by the Senate or by Congress is through his efforts—he will realize the situation and not be deterred by charges of inciting trouble from lending his great influence to some movement of that kind; but it has been disappointing that apparently no interest can be aroused at present in that behalf.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Iowa, with the permission of the senior Senator from that State, to consider the fact that we are in the closing hours of the session and that Senators are busy with appropriation and other important measures which would excuse some of them, perhaps, from attending the committee to which the junior Senator from Iowa refers.

Mr. KENYON. These hearings have been running for five or six weeks, I will say to the Senator from Utah. I think there are members of the Committee on Education and Labor who never have attended a meeting of that committee.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator. I do not wish to be led into any criticism of Senators who do not attend committee meetings. I understand how difficult it is for them to adjust their various engagements, and I do not want to depreciate in the least degree the very valuable work that has been done already by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I say of that committee, as I did of the Interstate Commerce Committee, that I hope it will continue its labors, for there can not be too much light shed upon this problem; there can not be too much energy devoted to its solution. I hoped that, if Congress could lift up the subjects which are named in this resolution into high prominence and turn the attention of the whole country to them and to these committees, we could awaken an interest in them that does not exist and will not exist if they are being dealt with by the ordinary standing committees of the two Houses.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I simply desire to say, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], that I think the cause of the inattention probably runs very much deeper than the one he suggests, because the President in his last message before he went abroad said that there was no need for reconstruction, except with reference to a policy having to do with the returning soldiers; that, so far as the general business of the country was concerned, it did not need to be reconstructed; that what we needed to do was to unhamper business and to unshackle commerce, and not to put the business men of the country in leading strings. I think perhaps that spirit has filtered down through Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope that that is not true, and I am going to conduct my argument upon the theory that it is not true; that is to say, that Senators and Members of the House feel the same responsibility to the country and to its welfare that the President feels, and that they will try as earnestly to dis-

charge their duties in these two Houses as the President will try to discharge his. I can not think that any considerable number of Senators suspend their activities until they hear the direction of the President. I may be driven to that conclusion presently, but I will not believe it until it is forced in upon me in a way that admits of no doubt whatever.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I say further that I believe that the effort to secure some legislation looking to alleviating the labor situation by this Congress was very much injured and made almost impossible by the strike in Seattle? I think that there was a very deep feeling concerning it. I talked with many Senators about it, and they could not get in harmony with the idea of a strike going on out there and at the same time there being unemployment in the country—a strike which did not seem to be justified at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can understand how that might influence some of them, but it ought not to influence anybody; that is, it ought not to delay consideration and legislation upon the labor problem. It is so much deeper than a strike that no resentment which may arise on account of a strike, justified or unjustified, ought to suspend for a single moment our effort in proposing a plan which will compose differences in principle between labor and what is generally called capital.

I do not think, either, that we ought to wait until the President returns in order that he may give us his opinion upon the subject. I have no doubt we will take under careful consideration whatever he may have to say to us upon it; but there are many things to be learned in the meanwhile that will be of vast value to those who do the work, and we ought to go forward. I do not expect to secure any legislation at this session; but I do hope that we can create these committees, so that they can continue their work during any recess which may occur, and may be in position to report at the next session of Congress, whether it comes in June or whether it comes in December, some plan that we may pursue that will help to allay the discontent and help to cure the ills which are so apparent.

Mr. President, I do not intend to pursue this subject further. I may remark, I think, without objection, that this concurrent resolution had its origin in one introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], and it became the subject of a conference between Members upon this side of the Chamber, and they seemed to be unanimously of the opinion that a concurrent resolution of this character ought to be adopted, and that these committees ought to be created, and that this work, which I regard as essential to the well-being of the Republic, should go forward, and should go forward immediately; and it is in the hope that I may secure a vote upon the concurrent resolution this afternoon that I have brought it before the Senate.

Mr. RANDELL and Mr. WEEKS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. I move that the motion of the Senator from Iowa be laid upon the table.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana moves to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from Iowa to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution referred to by him.

Mr. WEEKS. Is that subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Louisiana has moved to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I was or, my feet to debate the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana first addressed the Chair. The Chair recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. My motion was to lay the motion of the Senator from Iowa on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CUMMINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gronna	La Follette	Page
Beckham	Hale	Lenroot	Pittman
Calder	Henderson	Lewis	Poinceter
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Lodge	Pollock
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	McCumber	Pomerene
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	McKellar	Ransdell
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Reed
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Martin, Ky.	Robinson
Dillingham	Kellogg	Moses	Saulsbury
Fletcher	Kendrick	Nelson	Shafroth
France	Kenyon	New	Sheppard
Frelinghuysen	King	Norris	Sherman
Gay	Kirby	Nugent	Simmons
Gore	Knox	Overman	Smith, Ga.



Smith, Mich.	Sutherland	Trammell	Weeks
Smith, S. C.	Swanson	Vardaman	Williams
Smoot	Thomas	Wadsworth	Wolcott
Spencer	Thompson	Walsh	
Sterling	Townsend	Watson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. WEEKS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a motion to lay on the table, and is not debatable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. BAIRD], and vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the affirmative). By inadvertence I voted without recalling to my mind the fact that I was paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I thought he was present and voted. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present, I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—38.

Bankhead	Kendrick	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Kirby	Ransdell	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lewis	Reed	Thomas
Culberson	McKellar	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Ky.	Saulsbury	Trammell
Gay	Myers	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gore	Nugent	Sheppard	Williams
Henderson	Overman	Simmons	Wolcott
Hitchcock	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	
Jones, N. Mex.	Pollock	Smith, Ga.	

#### NAYS—33.

Calder	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
Colt	Kenyon	New	Sutherland
Cummins	Knox	Norris	Townsend
France	La Follette	Page	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Poindexter	Watson
Gronna	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Hale	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	
Johnson, Cal.	McNary	Smoot	
Jones, Wash.	Moses	Spencer	

#### NOT VOTING—25.

Ashurst	Fernald	King	Smith, Md.
Baird	Gerry	McLean	Underwood
Borah	Goff	Martin, Va.	Walsh
Brandeggee	Harding	Owen	Warren
Curtis	Hardwick	Penrose	
Dillingham	Hollis	Pheasant	
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shields	

So Mr. CUMMINS's motion was laid on the table.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] made the motion which has just prevailed I was about to add a few comments to what had been said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] on the subject of reconstruction. I am very glad he made the motion, because I think there were five or six Senators on the floor at that time, and as there are a few more present now, I have a somewhat better audience before which to express my views.

I have no intention of talking to kill time on this or any other subject; but in my judgment this is the most important question before the country. It is one that has been neglected to such a degree that it seems almost impossible now to get any action which will be of reasonable benefit to the country. As long ago as 1916 Great Britain had appointed committees to take up and consider every phase of the conditions which would exist after the war. As far as we know, that same condition existed in France and to a certain degree it existed in Germany, because I have here the reports from all of these countries, not as full a report from Germany as from other nations, but as indicative that every nation engaged in the war was preparing for those things which must come when peace came. Indeed, before Germany undertook the war she had made preparations for such commercial activities as would be necessary and could be undertaken after the war, assuming, of course, that it was a victory for the German nation.

Last September there was introduced a resolution which in considerable detail brought to the attention of the Senate this whole subject. That resolution has been referred to by the Senator from Iowa. Indeed, a revised resolution, prepared by the committee of which he is a member, has been submitted to the Senate. It is not a question of form or in what shape or, indeed, to what extent this resolution should carry the movement, but it is of vital importance to this country that something be done. The day I introduced the resolution—the 27th of last September, I think it was—there was a hasty gathering of the clans across the aisle.

The suggestion was made that something ought to be done about this; and a bill was prepared, which was introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. At that time both resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have no doubt that at that time there was some purpose on the part of the majority in this Chamber to take action, but for some unknown reason—which may be guessed but which I do not care to repeat—it was decided to take no action. Therefore those resolutions have been lying in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from that time to this, without any action whatever, while we have known that every day important committees of the British Parliament and of British citizens, important committees in France, important committees in Italy, and in every other European country, were working out schemes they considered necessary, not to bring the industrial world back to the conditions existing before the war, because anyone with any judgment must have known that that would be impossible, but to prepare the world for the new industrial conditions prevailing after the war. After-war normal conditions will never be the same as prewar normal conditions.

This reconstruction resolution applied to a great variety of subjects; first and foremost, that relating to labor. As the Senator from Iowa has correctly pointed out, we have seen labor conditions developing along certain lines in Europe so surely that it must have been indicative to any sane man that we would have to face similar problems. We knew that we had three and a half million men in the service, nearly 4,000,000; we knew we had as many more war workers, who had been diverted from their ordinary occupations to manufacturing those things the Government required during the war; we knew that when the war was over the manufacturing required by the Government would stop at once; that those three or four millions of war workers would be thrown on the market without any delay; that as rapidly as possible the men in the service would be dis-



charged, and that we would have four or five or six millions of people in the United States who would have to be transferred from one employment to another, even assuming that there were other employments ready to receive them all.

I submit to the Senate that not one single thing has been done by the Senate, or by Congress, or by the administration, to take care of these millions of American citizens who are certainly entitled to the first consideration of Congress, so that we see to-day a gradually increasing number of unemployed in every industrial center; we see these men who have been wearing the khaki, representing us on the other side, coming back here and being discharged, and no employment available for them.

How different was the course in Great Britain! As long ago as the summer of 1916 they had made a card index of every man in their military service. They noted whether or not he could go back to his former employment. They had noted what he could do if he could not go back to that employment. Every condition surrounding that man was noted on a card, so that they knew at once his particular circumstances; and they had determined not to discharge that man until he was ready to go directly into some employment, either the one he had followed before or a new occupation which might be available at the time.

The British Government was considering a great number of public developments, and many of them are being undertaken similar to the suggestion that has been made by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], similar to the suggestion for the construction of an intracoastal waterway system which has been suggested on this floor. Those things could have been very easily surveyed and have been worked out. They would have required the employment of thousands and tens of thousands of men. Yet we all know from the press that in every part of the country these men are practically walking the streets to-day and no attempt has been made by anybody connected with Congress or the administration to work out their destiny.

Now let me point out very briefly some of the other things that have been undertaken by Great Britain along this line and along the lines of reconstruction—some of the different actions that have been taken there. I want to say that the leading men of Great Britain, whether in Parliament or out of Parliament, have served on these committees; they have gone into the subjects industriously and minutely, and they have submitted reports to Parliament, some of which I have here. Of course, I am not going to use them on the floor, but I am going to point out to Senators what they have undertaken to do and, in fact, what they prepared to do, and what is being done to-day.

There is a ministry on reconstruction. Early in the consideration of this subject it was decided that it would not be practicable to undertake this great work through committees. After they had worked for six months and after-war problems had been considered by various and divers committees, a ministry of reconstruction was established to assume entire charge of the direction of the committees making these investigations.

They have a committee on shipping. I am reading now from a report made by the ministry on reconstruction, which has been given very general circulation in Great Britain.

Mr. KENYON. When was that committee appointed?

Mr. WEEKS. The committee on reconstruction was appointed in August, 1917. The committee on shipping has made their report, a copy of which I have here—a report of something like 100 pages—and although the Senate Committee on Commerce has been investigating the shipping problem, while a great number of men have been suggesting this and that scheme in order to work out our difficulties connected with that problem, we know perfectly well to-day we are as much in the air in regard to shipping and what we are going to do with our shipyards and the vessels now owned by the Government as we were six months ago. We have actually made no headway during that time. We have no plan. We do not know how we are going to operate these ships. We are talking about agencies abroad, agencies in this country, about rates, and all that sort of thing in the most desultory kind of way. There is not in the mind of a single member of the Shipping Board, in my judgment, a definite plan which may not be revised, and materially revised, even if it were put in operation by himself. Yet we have hundreds of millions of dollars, I do not know but billions of dollars, invested in either shipyards or shipping.

No prudent business man, if he were to have an operation of that kind imposed upon him months before it was to be put into his hands as a finality, would go into it without months before working out carefully a systematic and scientific plan for handling the great investment that has been made in shipping. Great Britain has considered this subject, and done so with great completeness.

Raw material. Great Britain through its Provinces, through its colonies, controls a great many raw materials, none of any particular moment, except coal and some iron within the area of Great Britain itself, and yet they have worked out with great minuteness the question of raw materials, where they are going to get them, how they are going to get them, and how they are going to pay for them. They do not propose to permit British capital to go into any country to purchase raw material or anything else without a controlling hand over that capital, and when the raw materials are purchased from some other country it is intended that there shall be a reciprocity connected with it which will enable the sale at the same time of British goods.

You will recall, Mr. President, that I introduced the other day a resolution relating to the embargo that had been established by Great Britain. Incidentally I should like to say now, that the embargo has already, quite likely to some degree as a result of the agitation which has taken place in this Chamber, been modified.

We sold in Great Britain in the year 1913 very nearly a million pairs of shoes—to be accurate, I should say 650,000 pairs of shoes—having a value of something like \$1,500,000. Not since the end of 1916 have we sold a single shoe in Great Britain. The embargo, since the embargo resolution was introduced in the Senate, has been modified, so that we are to be permitted to sell in Great Britain 25 per cent of the number of shoes sold there in the year 1913.

These are matters of trade. Every country is going to look after itself in such trade relations. There is no animosity connected with it. I personally have none whatever in relation to Great Britain or what it is doing with its trade; but I do believe as an American Senator, supposed to be looking after the interests of my constituents, that I should enter an inquiry when some very unusual procedure is being taken by another country, and an embargo is an unusual proceeding.

I recall that one or two Senators suggested that it seemed to be an anomaly for a Senator who was a believer in a high protective tariff to make a protest or suggest a protest against an embargo. That criticism has been taken up by certain newspapers in the country and heralded as one of the unusual things that sometimes happens in politics, and it has been referred to as an element of inconsistency on my part. There is just as much difference between an embargo and a protective tariff as there can be between any two elements that seem to have to do with the same particular subject. As a matter of fact, I never advocated an embargo. I think we are placing some embargoes on the goods of other countries in the United States, but that is directly contrary to the general trend of the policy we ought to be following in the United States. We ought to be clearing up such policies and getting back to normal trade conditions instead of creating artificial conditions, which can only result in more or less temper and dissatisfaction and inharmonious relations.

That leads me to bring to the attention of the Senate something that came to me in my correspondence this morning relating to hemp. It seems that the Philippine government has recently organized a corporation of \$50,000,000—\$25,000,000 in gold. The Philippine government owns 51 per cent of the stock of that corporation. It has passed the Philippine legislative body and has been signed in Washington by the Governor of the Philippines. The Philippine government, in other words, has gone into a trust to control all the hemp of the Philippine Islands. It owns 51 per cent of the stock of the company which is to control and make a monopoly of the hemp of the Philippine Islands. As a result of that, the price of hemp is something like 20 per cent higher than normal. It is as high practically as it was at the highest point during the war. Yet there is an ample supply of hemp in the world, and if that embargo—it is practically an embargo, placed on this product in the Philippine Islands, of which the Philippine government is the controlling factor, were removed the price of hemp would drop at once 20 or 25 per cent.

I call that to the attention of the Senate as a step taken in connection with the trade in which our people are involved, a step which could be prevented if the President of the United States were in Washington and saw fit to do it by vetoing that bill, which he has the power to do.

Certainly some attention ought to be given to such matters, because those islands are to a great extent dependent upon us. We are users of their hemp to a large degree, and yet our people will be paying at least 25 per cent more for hemp, as far ahead as we can see because of this corporation—in effect, a trust—which has been formed over there.

Mr. President, to get back to what Great Britain has done in relation to reconstruction—



Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield? I wish to ask a question for information.

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. We had a very friendly discussion the other day when the Senator offered his resolution. I wish to inquire of the Senator whether the trade restrictions, using a milder term than embargo, which have been employed by Great Britain since the war, are not the result of two causes: First, because she has, as a result of the war, considerable accumulations which might be called salvage; and, secondly, she has not the means with which to purchase some of the articles which this country and perhaps other countries desire to send to her?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the embargo on shoes, to which I particularly referred—that embargo had been brought to my attention and was my reason for making the inquiry of the State Department; it did not have anything to do with German propaganda, as has been suggested by some—was put on something like two years ago, I think, in the last days of 1916. It was entirely a war measure, and established notwithstanding the fact that we were buying some shoes of Great Britain for our Army. But it has been continued since the war. Complaints have been made. No action has been taken. The replies from the State Department were hardly satisfactory. I do not know now what action has been taken. Yet since the matter commenced to be agitated in the Senate, the bars have been let down so that we may send there 25 per cent of the number of shoes we were shipping in 1913.

I have no doubt Great Britain's purpose is to keep her people at work, to get her manufacturing operations up to full capacity, and so keep them up to a condition of the highest efficiency. I have no fault to find with that. If I were in their places, that is exactly what I should do. I would not have any citizens walking the street if I could avoid it by any reasonable measure. It is possible that they had an accumulation of shoes in Great Britain. I am not sure about that, but the assigned reason was to get their manufacturing establishments back to normal and keep their people employed. I think it is a sufficient reason for the action taken from their standpoint.

The only question at issue is whether the rest of the world is being treated fairly or whether these artificial restrictions can be placed on trade without creating a sentiment harmful to friendly relations. I have none other than the most friendly feeling toward Great Britain and had none other when I asked what our State Department was doing in regard to this particular subject.

Another committee, Mr. President, in Great Britain is that relating to the allocation of materials. I am not going to read just what was done by that committee, but the subject is one of great importance. The plans are all made as to what they shall do with material. They know that in this or that place there is not sufficient material for their manufacturers and it has to come from somewhere. They have ascertained the places from which it can be obtained, know how much shall be required, and have considered every phase relating to that subject.

The committee on transportation has made a complete report on the transportation facilities of Great Britain. Every phase of that question was given consideration two years ago. Everybody knows that the question of the future policy in regard to our transportation system should have been taken under consideration just as soon as the Government took over the railroads. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or somebody should have given that subject immediate consideration, and yet without a leader who really believed in reconstruction we have been drifting along all these days, and we now find ourselves in a condition where we do not know what we are going to do with these veins and arteries of our industrial system. If we avoid getting them all into the hands of receivers, we are going to do very well.

There is a committee on demobilization and reinstatement. These subjects were considered in connection with the disposition of labor, how they should demobilize their military and war workers. They worked that out, as I have said, in the greatest detail. They knew substantially where every man was going as soon as peace was made or as soon as he could be spared from the military service or industrial service incident and necessary to the war.

Industrial organization. How could industrial organization be transferred from the war purposes for which they were being used? It must be remembered that the manufacturing capacity of Great Britain has substantially doubled since the beginning of the European war. They necessarily doubled it in order to manufacture the necessary products for use in the war. What is going to come of that greatly increased capacity? If it were kept employed it would require the entire man power of Great Britain and the entire supply of materials that could be found

tributary to Great Britain. Necessarily some of it can not be kept employed; some of it will be destroyed. And yet it is important that this great industrial establishment which had been created as a result of the war should be given consideration after the war, and that has been done in that country.

Have we done so in the United States? Has any step been taken by Congress or the administration or anyone else to determine what shall be done with all this additional manufacturing capacity created in the United States for the purposes of the Government during the war? If there has been any single step taken in any direction I have not heard of it.

Then there was a joint industrial council considering plans for the coordination of the various industries of Great Britain—how one could be made to work with another, how there could be a transferral of employees from one to the other, how there could be a transferral of raw materials in different kinds of manufacturing industries. The whole question of working conditions was taken up, including the welfare conditions which have been referred to by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the whole question of old-age pensions, of health insurance, and every other welfare question troubling people everywhere in every country in the world.

We do not know what ought to be done in relation to these questions. It is possible and quite probable that some steps should be taken in every one of these welfare activities. And yet no man wants to inaugurate such policies until after a careful investigation has been made. There are two or three countries in the world where steps similar to the ones I have suggested have been taken. Reports are uncertain as to the result. Certainly what has been done, the results obtained in these countries, should be known to Congress and should be given consideration here. However, not the slightest thing has been done that I know of to provide for old-age pensions, for those who are unable to work on account of sickness, or to provide in any way for people not normal in their qualifications.

Rural development. There is nothing more important to this country or the world than the development of agriculture and everything relating to rural life, to induce people to go from the cities to the country. We have been attempting it in a haphazard way in various directions, and yet this subject has not been given the slightest consideration by Congress. The Secretary of the Interior, to be sure, has suggested a scheme to put returned soldiers and perhaps others on land now controlled by the Government, and yet all that land, so far as I am informed, must either be irrigated, or drained, or have some other action taken which will require years before it will be available for that purpose. I am entirely in sympathy with efforts to make available such lands. I am entirely in sympathy with any effort which will, along practical lines, get people from the cities back into the country. And yet we have not made any investigation whatever relating to that general subject since the war came on. That has been done by Great Britain with great thoroughness.

Problems of finance. Does anyone think the financing of this country is going to be an easy problem during the next few years, I do not care how patriotic we are? When we get the stories of these young fellows who are coming back from the other side, as every Senator does every day in the Marble Room, of the conditions which they think are unsatisfactory, we know that men are dissatisfied pretty nearly everywhere, and yet we have got to call on the people of this country to provide a \$6,000,000,000 loan within the next two months. We do not yet know anything about that loan. We have taken no steps to provide for the retirement of this great indebtedness which we are steadily increasing; we have taken no concerted step to provide for the future in a financial way; and yet Great Britain has done that as completely as a country could do it without knowing just the exact amount of indebtedness it would have at the end of the war.

When I speak of Great Britain, I refer particularly to that nation, but it is not necessary for me to again add that other countries have been doing practically the same thing. I do not exhibit these reports with any intent of reading them or with any intent of doing other than bringing to the attention of the Senate the volume of matter that has been considered in connection with these subjects. Here [exhibiting] is a final report of the royal commission on the natural resources, trade, and legislation of certain portions of His Majesty's Kingdom. It is a report that takes into consideration every question of raw material, manufacturing capacity, and every other capacity of the colonies of Great Britain. There are 196 pages of it, going into these subjects in the greatest detail. Here [exhibiting] are reports of departmental committees. There [exhibiting] is a report on medical problems relating to the subject of aviation alone. Of course we know that there



must necessarily be some new problems relating to the health conditions of men who are going to follow the occupation of aviation; and here we see that Great Britain has already given that subject thorough study.

Here [exhibiting] are some reports on national expenditures. There have been some seven or eight of them made. They are the most complete financial reports that I have seen issued by any country. Committees have been working on those for more than two years.

Here [exhibiting] is a report on forestry, which is as important a subject in Great Britain as it is in the United States. There are 105 pages of that report. It goes in great detail into the subject of reforestation and the question of the different kinds of wood and advocates the use of lands not available for other uses for forestry purposes. They have already planned to employ in forestation a considerable part of those who might otherwise be unemployed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts does not quote any legislative action of Great Britain, but he merely quotes reports. Our libraries are full of official reports, and every department of our Government has been making studies on these and similar questions during the last year. It seems to me that the citations which the Senator gives, referring to those reports showing activity in Great Britain, might very easily be matched by calling upon our Secretary of the Interior, our Secretary of Commerce, and our other departments of the Government, which we know have been engaged in these matters. The Senator would find similar reports and similar information gathered for us by those departments.

Mr. WEEKS. They would not be similar reports nor would similar information be gathered in this country, but I will not camouflage my reply with that statement. Here [exhibiting] is a complete statement of the legislation that has been enacted. I do not want to encumber the Record with it, but Great Britain has legislated on practically every one of these subjects, where legislation is desirable.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will put into the Record at least what amount of legislation has been actually enacted, but I want to call the Senator's attention to another great distinction between the United States and Great Britain.

Great Britain had probably 15 per cent of her population in the Army and had them in the Army for three or four years. We had about 4 per cent—less than 4 per cent—of our men in the Army; we only had them in for a few months, and had only half of them on the other side. The industrial system of Great Britain was torn to pieces and has got to be reorganized, while our industrial system has hardly been touched. Great Britain to-day is full of men who are out of work; but I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, so far as my knowledge is concerned, most of the States of the Union now lack men rather than work. It may be that in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where the munition factories were concentrated, there is a percentage of nonemployment, but in the main throughout the United States, in the South and in the central West, the great problem is to find men for the work and not to find work for the men. So we have not the task that the countries of the Old World have, and we need not annoy ourselves so much about the problem.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the Senator depreciate the important tasks we have in this country, notwithstanding they may not be as great as those in Europe?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that they are enormously exaggerated, and I think that such talks as the Senator from Massachusetts is now making tend to give the impression to the country that evils exist which do not exist. I have in my hand here a quotation from the Saturday Evening Post which expresses my idea on the subject, and, if the Senator does not object, I should like to read a few lines of it.

Mr. WEEKS. I have no objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is as follows:

A PLAGUE OF PANACEAS.

A new craze is sweeping over the country as silly, as pestilential as the dancing madness that seized the world just before the war. Everybody wants to reform everybody else and to settle everything that is wrong with anything. Our mails are choked with passionate letters, our wastebaskets are overflowing with "thoughtful" pamphlets—all touting new panaceas.

Everything from pap to dynamite is being recommended for what ails the world and the other fellow. Every method of relieving him of his pocketbook—for that is always the seat of the other fellow's disease—is being advocated. Some favor chloroforming him with taxes as an easy cure; others treating him with a piece of lead pipe as being quicker and even more merciful. Some pear-headed professors and members of the allied trades of mental shut-ins are working in shifts turning out their celebrated socialistic soothing sirup, guaranteed to cure financial corpulence and the black curse of that bourgeois home

life. Bright young men who make a living shaking up bright young thoughts in bright young papers are offering their snappy-tasting Bolshevik sarsaparilla for those dull world aches. One group of ladies is brewing over bonfires a cure-all for everything, while another group denies that there is any efficacy in their medicine and wants to cheer up the plain old problems by running them with baby-blue ribbon.

There is a whole drug store—in fact, a whole chain of drug stores—filled with remedies for everybody and everything. If you don't like our sugar-coated socialistic pills, try this bottle of Russian bolshevism, it will bring tears to your eyes; or Prof. Thesis's socialistic pap, compounded for weaker stomachs.

This is the greatest era of pap, piffle, and poison that the world has ever seen. The old family doctor hasn't a chance; nobody but a quack can prescribe nowadays. But sensible people learned long ago that there is no health in the patent-medicine bottle; no way to a sound body except through sane living, simple exercise, and hard work. Throw the bottles out of the window—it won't hurt if you throw out a few of the quacks with them—and let's all go back to work.

Mr. President, I am not laying all those things at the door of the Senator from Massachusetts; but I think we in the Senate ought not to give encouragement to this pessimistic tone, to this paternalistic idea, that we in Congress have got to set the wheels in motion in the United States, when all we have got to do is to let things alone and let nature take its course. We have a great, rich, powerful country, filled with industrious and intelligent people and unlimited resources; we have a third of the gold of the world; we are the great creditor nation of the world; and have become so as a result of the war. All we have got to do is to go to work. The amount of legislation that is necessary to set the wheels of industry in motion is insignificant. Compared with the ills of the Old World ours are nothing at all, and I do not approve of the idea of lecturing everybody all the time because Congress does not do something.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, or possibly the Senator from Nebraska will feel called upon to answer.

If these matters are of so slight importance, and if everything is so exactly right, I should like to know why it is proposed to institute in the league of nations a bureau for the purpose of taking measures to settle or compose the labor problems of the world, including our own? The Senator from Nebraska is, I judge from the newspapers, a very ardent advocate of the proposed league of nations. If we are to be quiescent in the matter, why should not the league of nations be quiescent also?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I judge by the comment that has just been made by the Senator from Nebraska, if that problem were put up to him, he would lean back and yawn, and say, "Do nothing; it will take care of itself"; but if he wishes the floor to say what he would do, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. President, I will take great pleasure, as soon as I can compile the legislation which has been passed by Great Britain relating to the subject, in presenting it to the Senate. I have no desire to disturb anyone; I have no desire to deny that there is some reason in the flippant newspaper article the Senator from Nebraska has read. It is true that almost everybody seems to be disturbed, and a great many people who have had very little experience are proposing antidotes for every imaginable disease they think exists in the body politic; and yet we know perfectly well that we are never going back to the conditions of the past; that we have got to adjust ourselves to new conditions; and we do so by doing nothing, by letting everything drift, by gradually finding large numbers of people out of employment.

In this connection I wish to suggest that if the Senator from Nebraska wishes any confirmation of the statement that there are people out of employment, let him read the speeches of the Secretary of Labor or the secretary of the American Federation of Labor, or anyone else who has any statistics on that subject. Reports are being received from 150 industrial centers every week, and every week there is a large increase in the number of unemployed. I do not know whether or not there is need for labor in some village in Nebraska, but I can say that practically every industrial center in the United States has a surplus of labor, and some of the centers have a very large surplus of labor. One corporation I know of that was manufacturing for the war has turned adrift more than 20,000 men, or possibly women. There is a great surplus of labor in this country, and I can not adopt or subscribe to the policy suggested by the Senator that we should sit by and do nothing. I do not think that anything will be done until a Republican Congress is in session. Then I believe these problems will be taken up and considered; but by that time the procession is going to have passed us; the nations that do things systematically, based on scientific plans, are going to be so far ahead



of us in relation to reconstruction and the trade developed as a result of the war that we will not even be in the running if we are not careful.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Mississippi if he desires.

Mr. WEEKS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may print in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an editorial from the Philadelphia North American.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial referred to is as follows:

WE ARE UNREADY FOR PEACE, TOO.

Measured by old standards, America's contribution to the war already has been enormous. Yet when our relative resources and economic capacity are taken into account and our effort is compared with that put forth by Great Britain and France, computation shows that we are making about a 30 per cent war. Nearly four years after the ordeal of democratic civilization began and 15 months after Germany started open warfare against us our undertakings represent not more than one-third of our capabilities.

Our national craft drifted into the war stern foremost, for we were unprepared materially and spiritually, and for a year it was buffeted about by wind and current until the gusts of threatened disaster swung it on a straight course.

The Government at last has made war its supreme business; all its thought and energy henceforth are to be devoted to that task. If the allies can hold out through the summer, substantial American aid will reach them then, and in greater volume next year; but this Nation's maximum strength will not be in the field until 1920, the sixth year.

By that time all our economic and human resources will be mobilized for and concentrated upon one thing—war—as they should be and must be. But while it is required that we shall enlist all our energies in armed defense of the world's liberties and our own, there is another task just as imperative, neglect of which will be as perilous as neglect of war. And that is the achieving of preparedness for peace.

It might be argued that a nation is justified in organizing its affairs and its life without taking into account the possibility of war, but it is axiomatic that when it organizes for war it defies reason and challenges fate if it does not take into account the absolute certainty of eventual peace. If America's giant strength is made effective in time, a lasting world peace will result. If our efforts are so belated that an indecisive settlement is forced, there will be peace just the same, even though it be temporary and insecure. In any event peace is inevitable.

Its problems will be new, vast, and compellingly urgent. Yet the Government exhibits no interest in them, while eminent leaders of the opposition sagely advise that everything will be made all right by passage of a "strong" tariff bill.

The most obvious lesson of the conflict, to begin with, is that when it terminates Europe will no longer be "3,000 miles away," as Secretary Baker lightly said. In commercial and political relationships our supposed isolation will be as mythical as our security from military aggression has proved to be.

We shall face a changed world; nothing will be, can be, quite the same as before. For example, the magnitude of the war, involving not only great nations, but groups of nations, in world-girdling alliances, has created new standards of measurement to govern the operation of industrial, commercial, and financial enterprises. Capitalizations which four years ago seemed colossal will be dwarfed by those of undertakings which will have behind them the power of mighty governments.

Already the term "billions" is taking the place in the language of commerce and finance which the term "millions" occupied a few years ago. So stupendous has been the increase in the size and scope of industrial projects that it seems as if only the great "trusts" of this country, once feared as a menace to our institutions and stability, will be powerful enough to make headway in the remorseless struggle for world trade. It is clear, at least, that it will need the establishment of a wise, strong, and comprehensive governmental policy to save the smaller units of commercial and industrial enterprise from being overwhelmed.

Our elaborate system of credits, laboriously built up during a century of development and unparalleled expansion, has been overturned in a few months. Not the banks, but the Government—necessarily so, in the great emergency of the war—now wields this power and dictates who shall and shall not be permitted to use the credit resources. When peace is restored the transition from the present to the old system will not be automatic and it can not be speedy; indeed, it may not be possible to restore more than a semblance of prewar conditions.

A Government with vision must be prepared when that time comes to vote, if necessary, credits as vast for the promotion of the enterprises of peace as have been voted for carrying on the business of war. For unless such projects are financed upon a scale approaching that attained in the supporting of war activities, this Nation's industrial and commercial projects can not maintain themselves against like forces in other countries with the backing of their governments.

The Federal power will never entirely relinquish that control of many public utilities which the exigencies of war have compelled it to assume; and a broad, effective policy must be framed that will insure improved service to the public, together with justice to the investor.

Any pronounced business depression or condition approaching panic following the war would fatally compromise the Nation's future, and averting such a peril presents a vast and complex problem. Wages, which now admittedly are at an artificially high level, must not be permitted to slump suddenly, and the necessary readjustment must be controlled so that it shall harmonize with a recession in the cost of living. Employment at good wages must be made plentiful, not only for the workers at home, but for the millions who will return from Europe to resume their places in the economic life of the country. For it is obvious that only by increased efficiency and intensified production can the Nation carry the gigantic burden of war debts.

The controversy between capital and labor as to just division of the rewards of production will be more acute then than ever before, and for equitable settlement of its manifold issues there must be established an effective governmental policy. Multiplied productivity will be so vital a factor in re-creating stability that the promotion of it will be as much a function of the Government as is the prosecution of the war to-day.

A firm, far-seeing national policy must be evolved which will insure our new position as one of the foremost maritime nations of the world.

We shall possess the greatest merchant marine afloat. But if this asset is to be permanent there must be governmental assistance to meet like expedients of other nations and preserve for those engaged in the industry the American standard of living.

A vital, if not the most important, problem of preparedness for peace will be the protection and stimulation of agricultural production. The whole world has had a convincing demonstration that food is the fundamental element in national defense, in the winning of a war; no less, assuredly, will it control the destinies of peoples in the future of peace. Then, as now, intensive industrial development will tend steadily to increase the disparity in numbers between the producers of food and its consumers, and the problem of sustaining the population will be of continuing difficulty and urgency.

We have merely sketched in the vaguest outline some of the questions which already cast their shadows across our path, but we have suggested enough to show how closely they concern our economic and national existence. And to these matters all nations are addressing themselves—except the United States. It is needless to speak of Germany, for hers is a war of money greed as well as political brigandage, and she laid her plans of commercial aggression simultaneously with her plans for military conquest; before a shot was fired she had charted her business and financial course for after the war, and with every change in the map has systematically adapted her trade program so as to be ready to exact the last possible advantage in the future contest. But Great Britain has been well-nigh as alert and efficient in strengthening the foundations of her maritime and commercial structure for the coming test. Trained experts in every line of production and distribution are ceaselessly employed in drafting plans and policies which will be ready to be put into operation when the war ceases. France, too, despite the terrible strain upon her powers, is intensively preparing for the struggle of peace.

Only in America is this great and pressing enterprise neglected, if not ignored. We have failed to discern in Washington an indication that any organized attention is being given to problems that require foresight and unremitting study and forceful action. This is a subject which does not arouse the statesmanlike genius of Senators JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS and Ollie James, the eminent spokesmen for the administration; nor of the southern committee chairmen and other leaders whose interest in "peace" helped to delay our preparations for war. We find in the extended biography of Col. House, which is now appearing, no hint that his marvelous faculties of divination and prophecy have been brought to bear upon the matter.

Perhaps there is some excuse for the indifference of the administration forces to the problems of peace, because they are just becoming genuinely preoccupied with the necessities of war. But just as barren is the record of the Republican group.

On the widest and bloodiest battle field in human history mighty military and spiritual forces are contending for mastery, and the result will determine the fate of generations unborn. It would be impossible to overestimate the gravity of the issue, the peril which failure would bring to this country, its political and material interests. Yet the menace there is hardly greater than that which lies in the fact that while the other nations are perfecting preparedness for the future, we remain unready and inert.

America drifted into the war stern foremost, and only through the efforts of others has had time to fit herself for its stern demands. But if she drifts stern foremost into peace, without chart or compass to guide, nothing can save her from the rocks of disaster.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not quarrel with the labored laudation of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] of the work of the British House of Commons. I have long since entertained the view that the Government of Great Britain, the Government of Canada, the Government of Australia, and the Government of New Zealand were very much more democratic than our own, and that the Government of each of those countries responds very much more quickly and very much more fully to popular impulse than our own does. Nor shall I quarrel with the Senator from Massachusetts about the deficiencies of the American Government. We tried to establish over here the best government in the world. I think most of us with much sense now confess that we did not succeed perfectly, but it is a pretty good Government after all, and it does not deserve quite the exorcism which the Senator from Massachusetts has given it to-day; nor does it arouse the thought in any fair mind that it can not be functioned unless the Republican Party is in power. They were in power for the better part of the last half century without causing the landation of sensible people for either efficiency or sincerity of purpose.

I have heard a great deal of talk on the floor of the Senate about this or that or the other executive department "not functioning." I find that the Senate comes a great deal nearer not functioning than any executive department connected with the Government. I find that it chiefly does not function because of what has just been illustrated. Here is a long debate by two Senators—upon what? A proposition of absolute infantillage, infantile nonsense—to create six new committees to take over the subjects matter of which some committee or another of the Senate now has jurisdiction. I defy the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to mention a subject matter contained in this resolution of which some existing standing committee has not jurisdiction. If the existing committees selected by this body in the usual way have, as Senators say, proven complete failures, what hope is there that six new committees selected in the same way and by the same party machinery will find a way out?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, Mr. President; but the Senator from Mississippi knows perfectly well that Senators are burdened to the limit by their legislative duties, especially under the condi-



tions that exist in a short session of Congress. Furthermore, it is not proposed necessarily that the members of these committees or commissions shall all be Members of Congress; it is proposed to draw in the technical judgment of the country and use that in preparing the information that is deemed necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate unduly, but the resolution in part reads:

That there are hereby created six committees, to be known as the Joint Congressional Committees on Reconstruction. Each of said committees shall be composed of five Senators and five Representatives in Congress. The members of said committees shall be selected as follows: The Senators in the manner provided in the rules of the Senate for the selection of the standing committees of the Senate and the Representatives in the manner provided in the rules of the House for the selection of the standing committees of the House.

That is the authoritative denial and answer to the Senator's assertion.

The Senators members of these six proposed new committees would still be Senators and still be "burdened to the limit by their legislative duties," and this would still remain a "short session."

The Senator says Great Britain has done a whole lot of work and we have not done anything. In that statement the Senator is absolutely mistaken. If he means by "we" merely the Government and not anybody else, we perhaps have not done all that we ought to have done; but these United States, thank God, have not reached the condition yet where business and labor and capital depend entirely or even mainly upon Senators and Representatives. The people of the United States have been reorganizing themselves for peace, and in a very rapid manner and in a very efficient manner. I am tired of hearing of the "inefficiency" of the American Government and of the American people. I tell the Senator from Massachusetts right now, that it is the most efficient Government, the most efficient business, and the most efficient people upon the surface of this globe, Germans not excepted, and we have proved it. One of the most precious heritages of the American people is the fact that they have never acquired the habit of looking altogether to the Government for organization or reorganization or anything else necessary to their prosperity. Indeed, during this war, business men from steel magnates to farmers have helped the Government more than the Government has helped business. If this Government had been forced to depend for its awakening and organization for war purposes—naval, military, and industrial—upon the Senate it would have presented to the world a pitiable aspect.

But even in so far as the Government is concerned, the Government has functioned, and in a very important—even remarkable—manner.

The Senator had a great deal to say about British vocational education. We have vocational education legislation. He had a great deal to say about finances. We have a farm-credit system and a reserve-bank system; none better in the world. The Senator had a great deal to say about restoring crippled soldiers. We are restoring them every day under a magnificent medical system, proven superior upon the fields of France and Flanders to any other system that offered itself there, whether French, Belgian, or British. There is no justification for this pessimism and there is no justification for the idea that this Republic is going to the bowwows, whether from Bolshevism or from capitalism or from anything else. It has common sense. Its sovereignty is based in the people, and the people have common conscience and common sense, and they are going to take care of their country. The only mistake about New England, and the Senator from Massachusetts as one part of it, is that from the beginning of this Government down to now they have had a sort of an idea that the Government ought to take care of the people. The balance of us have had the idea that the people were capable of taking care of the Government, and that the people were, more than that, capable of taking care of themselves to the fullest extent, provided the Government would give them fair play and equal opportunity. That is all that is required.

Mr. President, the Senator seems to be ignorant of the difference between the *modus operandi* in the House of Commons and in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States. We attend to nearly all of our business through standing committees. The House of Commons attends to its most important business through special committees, appointed for the express purpose of taking care of particular problems. The Senator, with all his education and his information, seems to have been ignorant of that fact. He goes on here to cite committee after committee appointed by the House of Commons to deal with this particular subject and that particular subject. That is what the House of Commons always has done. We have left certain standing committees, vested with certain

jurisdictions, to take care of all questions, generally described, and with no difficulty about finding out which committee is charged with jurisdiction.

The Senator referred to several things here that would go to the Military Affairs Committee, several that would go to the Interstate Commerce Committee, several that would go to the Commerce Committee—canals and waterways, and linking them up with one another and the railroads, and all that. "Cooperation permitted to increase efficiency, reduce cost, and enable the country to successfully meet foreign competition," and so on, are mentioned in this resolution. We have already passed the Webb law for that very last purpose. It is not true that Congress has done nothing.

The Senator speaks of the British Government undertaking to control prices. That has been settled with us by an act of Congress, and the Government has been controlling them to a certain extent—as far as Congress thought was right.

The Senator speaks of "Government loans to private enterprises." The Finance Corporation has been not quite attending to that, but it has been saying when private enterprises should be permitted to float their bonds, at any rate, and has been guiding the course of capitalization.

The Senator speaks of British Government "supervision of capital issues." That comes under the same heading.

I could read this whole business, run through it, and show that every single subject matter mentioned in the concurrent resolution to be dealt with by these unnecessary six committees has either been dealt with by some commission of this Government or is subject to be dealt with by some standing committee of the Senate and some standing committee of the House.

What is this infantile proposition? It is just simply to create six more committees in the Senate, with the laudable purpose upon the part of various Senators, of course, to get upon them, and to take over to those six committees entire jurisdiction of all the business of the existing standing committees of this body, because if you will read this concurrent resolution through you will find that there is not a subject matter of legislation that is neglected, except perhaps the jurisdiction that goes to the Naval Affairs Committee. That is about all that is not transferred to one or the other of these six leading committees that have been evolved from the minds of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator says that he would like to know "why the league of peace wants to deal with labor problems" if we can not deal with them here. I will tell you why, and you know why without my telling you. It is not that American labor wants to do it, but it is that European labor wants to do it, in order to bring about some equalization of compensation for labor throughout the world. Our labor does not need it. We have a higher rate of compensation for labor than any other nation on the earth, and we had it even prior to the time when this country became "the United States of America." We had it when we were separate colonies. We had it owing to the fact that we had less population and more work than anybody else. We have it yet; but it is necessary and it is right that a league of nations should deal with certain labor problems, especially in connection with the merchant marine, so as to try to drag up to the level of American compensation and treatment the sailors of the whole world, if we can, and give nobody any advantage of the others. So long as our merchant marine is forced to pay more for labor than the others pay, we can not support a merchant marine, no matter how cheaply we build it, because we can not operate as cheaply. There are a dozen other labor problems that might well be considered by a league of nations, and in a measure internationalized, provided only that we do not lower our own labor standard of living, but rather raise that of others.

The Senator asks me what definite plans we have made anywhere—"what definite plans that can not be revised," to use his language. Why, thank God, we are not asses enough to make any definite plans now that can not be revised in the future, if they ought to be revised; and if we have any sense we know they will have to be revised. Why, even when we formed the Constitution of this country we left ourselves free to revise it. My only quarrel is that we made the method of revising it a little too hard. Anybody who thinks that he can arrive at an ultimate solution of any problem does not know what human nature is. He takes no note of time, nor of evolution, nor of revolution, nor of progress. I do not want, above all things, to fix my adoption to any definite rule not subject to revision which might be constructed by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa with myself even as a third member of the committee.

He tells us what Great Britain has done about "lands and forests." In the first place, she has no lands to spare; in the



second place, she has no forestry except parks, and they have been largely destroyed; and, God knows, these men from the West can tell you that if the United States has made any mistake at all upon that subject, she has made it by going too far. We have included in forestry reservations a whole lot of land that the daughters and sons of the American Republic ought to be cultivating in private ownership right now.

Then the Senator tells us that Great Britain is "controlling her raw materials," and he seems to think that, therefore, we ought to be prohibiting the indiscriminate exportation of our raw materials. The Senator shakes his head. At any rate, he mentioned the fact that Great Britain was restricting the sale of her raw materials, and he said it in a critical mood. That far, I think, he will not shake his head at me. The difference between us and Great Britain is this, that the "tight little island" of itself has no raw materials, except coal and iron, and not enough of iron to export to any great extent, except in finished products; and here is a great country filled plumb full of raw materials—cane sugar, cotton, beet sugar, hides, copper, coal, zinc—oh, I can not mention them all, because I can not think of them upon my feet at one moment; but we have them all. In the business of reorganizing herself after this destructive war—and the Senator from Nebraska was exactly right in saying that Great Britain's work of reorganization is ten times more difficult than ours is—Great Britain must, to some extent, control the distribution of the raw materials of the British Empire, so that they shall come to British industries until British industries are reorganized on a peace basis and upon their feet. We do not need to do it, because we can give our industries all the raw materials they need and have plenty more to export, from cotton to wheat and from coal to copper. But in so far as it is necessary to conserve our raw materials in the ground, if the Senator thinks we have done nothing, he is mistaken again. In fact, if there is any criticism of us again we have done too much. There is oil in the ground and coal in the ground and gold and silver and lead in the ground in Alaska and in the United States that ought long ago to have been let loose for private enterprise, which we have kept under governmental control under the plea of conservation.

It comes with rather poor grace, I think, from a Republican to talk about Great Britain putting an embargo on the exportation of certain articles. What has your party amounted to, from Alexander Hamilton down to now, except a party of restriction of international commerce? You have preached it as a virtue. The Senator tells me there is all the difference in the world between a high protective tariff upon an article and an embargo. That depends upon how high the tariff is. If you put the tariff high enough to amount to an embargo, it is an embargo, whether you call it so or not; and when you were in power I have forgotten now how many rates you had that were over 100 per cent, and that amounted to absolute prohibition. There is no difference, except one of camouflage, between that and putting an embargo upon importation of the article. Luckily the Constitution prevented his party from treating any exports as they did treat so many imports.

I agree with the Senator that Great Britain is wrong in attempting to restrict international trade. I believe that she will hurt herself more than she will help herself by it, just as I believe that we have hurt ourselves more than we have helped ourselves by it; but it does not lie in the Senator's mouth to make that objection. If we have had a right—and we have had the right as a matter of international law and a matter of international ethics—to control our own domestic affairs with whatever tariff we choose, then Great Britain has it, too, and the Senator must not forget that at two distinct periods of our history we resorted to nonintercourse and to embargo, and nobody in the world denied our international right to do it. A great many people said that we were stupid about it and that we were hurting ourselves more than we were hurting our enemies, and we were; and Great Britain is doing it now, and she will find it out.

If the Senator thinks that this little idle talk around here in the Senate led Great Britain to modify her embargo on boots and shoes, he is awfully mistaken. I doubt whether David Lloyd George and the British cabinet ever heard of these senatorial debates here upon boots and shoes. Of course, I realize where the cloven hoof comes in as far as Massachusetts is concerned. Whenever you touch boots and shoes, you touch Lynn, and whenever you touch Lynn, you touch Massachusetts, and Massachusetts would mighty near rather secede than to have an embargo on any of her favorite productions. But I doubt if the British cabinet ever heard of what the Senator said or what the other Senators said upon that subject. As I read it, they found that they needed the boots and shoes and

they concluded that they had better let enough of them come in, and they did let that amount come in.

Mr. President, Mr. Wilson is in Europe—I purposely called him Mister—as the Chief Magistrate of this country, attempting to the best of his ability to bring about a treaty of peace which will be just and comparatively permanent, attempting to the best of his ability to create a league of nations which shall have some influence, at any rate, in preventing war.

So far as I can discover, over this entire world there are only three sets of people who are trying to throw cold water on him. One set are the Bolsheviks here and abroad, to which neither of the Senators nor any Senator of this body belongs nor with which any Senator of this body has any sympathy. The next set are those infinitely assinine female bonfire burners in Lafayette Square. The next set are a few Senators and a few Representatives in the Congress of the United States taking every opportunity to stick a dagger under his fifth rib in the name of something else, while they profess to have no antagonism either to him or to his mission.

What is his mission? Oh, if he just could carry it out, if he just were left unhampered and uncrippled! You say it is idealism. It is. Some of you say it is visionary. It is not. Idealism in its highest form is the most practical thing in this world. It is not visionary. It is very far from it.

I have read these articles of this league of nations. My only quarrel with them is that they do not go far enough. I would not go quite so far as ex-President Taft advises, but I would go further than these articles go.

You tell me you have to make certain sacrifices of national do-as-you-please-ism if you do go that far. Of course you have. When you blockade and embargo the recalcitrant and lawless, covenant-breaking nations, if you shall be called upon to do it, you hurt an old democratic principle, because just in proportion as you punish them by the denial of your trade you punish yourselves by the denial of theirs. But there is a difference. You will be punished by the denial of only one nation's trade, and the lawless nation would be punished by the denial of the trade of all 14 members of the league of nations, which would be a different proposition.

There he is over there doing his best work as far as he can, and there is nothing more tragic, to my mind, than that he shall be there needing above all things the sympathy of his own people, and yearning that his own hands should be upheld while he is engaged in trying to consummate the highest form of international idealism for the benefit of humanity and of the world, while here you have been striking him in the fifth rib with a dagger every time, here and there, under some pretense or another.

What good were you doing to the world, what good were you doing Europe, what good were you doing humanity by it? He went over there trying to do his work. He went over to governments of parliamentary administration where a vote against the administration meant a retirement and the deprivation of power, and they could hardly understand why it did not mean that in the United States, too; he went handicapped and crippled by the result of the last election. I am not blaming anybody. The American people held the election. They had a right to hold it, and they had a right to vote as they chose. But that was the situation, and yet he has met the situation dauntlessly and has wrought out of it something that will be the beginning of a great thing.

I have never insisted upon the league of nations because I was not competent to define the league of nations until our allies had had their equal say. But I have insisted upon a league of nations, and as I said here upon the floor of the Senate once before, I would rather it would begin with 14; but if it could not begin with 14, I would rather it would begin with the 7 allies; and if it could not begin with the 7 allies, then I would rather it should begin with France, Great Britain, and the United States; and if I could not have it begin in that way, I would have it begin with the English-speaking, self-governing Commonwealths of the British Empire and the English-speaking, self-governing States in these United States rather than not to begin at all. After the beginning it will evolve itself just as this American Union evolved itself from the old New England confederacy and from the commercial agreement between Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi mean to imply that the resolution of which he has been speaking is brought forward as a criticism of the President or as an attack upon his mission in Europe?



Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I do not think it has anything to do with that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to be assured of that, because—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. I am afraid I got about as far off of your resolution as your resolution got off of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not find it in my heart to criticize the Senator from Mississippi for getting a long ways from the river and harbor bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think you do, but I am not further from your resolution than your resolution is from the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not take the Senator from Mississippi to account. I simply wish to be understood that this resolution could not possibly be construed into an attack upon the President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think so, but I think some of the observations made about it were.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not any observations that fell from my lips—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not one.

Mr. CUMMINS. Because I am just as much in favor of a league of nations—

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I am.

Mr. CUMMINS. As the Senator from Mississippi can possibly be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have known that for a good while, and the Senator from Iowa knows that I know it.

I started to introduce a resolution this morning to suspend the Senator from Massachusetts from membership in this body for three weeks upon the ground that he really did talk about the river and harbor bill, the question before the Senate, for 10 minutes, about the intracoastal canal back of Cape Cod and Nantucket. It was a violation of the recent customs of the Senate to have talked about the matter under consideration. The ordinary course for a Senator is to start to discuss the cosmogony of the world and to wind up with a little disquisition upon the habits of the flea.

Mr. CUMMINS. I wish the Senator from Mississippi to know that, so far as my remarks were concerned, they were directed pointedly to the question before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were not. They were directed pointedly to your resolution, which was not before the Senate. The river and harbor bill was before the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi is as ill informed with regard to that matter as he thought the Senator from Massachusetts was with regard to the proceedings in the House of Commons. I made a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this resolution, and I directed my observations to that motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. CUMMINS. They had nothing to do with the river and harbor bill, and that question was not before the Senate when I made my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The river and harbor bill was before the Senate and the Senator moved this resolution to take its place, and I reckon he knew that the resolution was not going to take its place.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, I had the highest hope that I would succeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You had?

Mr. CUMMINS. And I came near to doing it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is a good deal like that gentleman who bought a bottle of hair restorer from a bald-headed barber. His faith was ill placed. I thought, of course, he merely wanted an opportunity to ventilate the resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all. I had real hopes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought he wanted to express his opinion upon it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had no idea he had any expectation that he would displace the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I had great hope that the Senate would for a moment proceed to the consideration of this resolution. I knew that there were a good many Senators who believed it ought to be considered, and I had the profoundest hope, and indeed a great belief, that I would find a sufficient number of Senators on the other side of the Chamber who believe likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I apologize to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I accept the apology.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I apologize, and I submit that the definition of St. Paul about faith has been once more justified.

Mr. CUMMINS. Surely, whenever we deal with matters under these circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," but I really did not believe the Senator ever expected the resolution to pass.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi remember the vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Iowa tells me he did, that is sufficient.

Mr. CUMMINS. The motion was defeated by only a very few votes. It would have required only a moment of reflection to have caused three or four of my Democratic friends to have voted for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe it is true that there were not very many votes one way or the other in the majority, but the votes cast for your resolution, as you must know, were chiefly votes of those who wanted to shelve the river and harbor appropriation bill independently of your resolution. They were not for your resolution; they were against the river and harbor bill.

Mr. President, I did have something else I wanted to say, but owing to this dissertation upon the strenuous and unexpected qualities of faith I believe I have about forgotten what it was, and consequently I will stop now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the embargo by Great Britain, except to say that I am satisfied Great Britain will look after her own interests, and I rather admire her for doing it. If she does not look after her own interests, nobody else will. All I regret is that we do not look after our interests a little more closely. I hope that we shall.

Regarding the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, I am just going to call attention to the resolution which I introduced covering this same matter, and the difference between my resolution and the one that is reported from the committee. I wish to call attention to the fact also that the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, while it has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, is reported, I think, without any recommendation whatever. It simply is sent to the Senate and put on the calendar apparently as an act of courtesy on the part of the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I explain that to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall be very glad to have the Senator explain it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I happen to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I found after a great deal of experience that I could only get it out of the committee in that way. Otherwise it would have been buried in the committee and we would have had no opportunity whatever to consider it. It was rather an unsatisfactory way to have it come out, but it either had to come out in that way or not at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is better to come out that way than not to come out at all; that is, there is some chance of getting it considered or getting action upon it when you get it on the calendar. I know that by experience. I had some connection with a measure that was before a committee which was equally divided upon it. I finally persuaded the committee to report it out without recommendation, and now it is a law. It probably would not have been a law if I had not gotten it on the calendar in that way. So I suppose that was about the situation with reference to this resolution; the committee would not report it favorably, but, out of consideration for the Senator from Iowa, they reported it out, so that it would get on the calendar and he would have an opportunity to try to bring it before the Senate anyhow.

Mr. President, with the purposes of this resolution I am in hearty accord. Something ought to have been done a long time ago looking toward preparing to meet the problems that were bound to come to us when the war closed. With a view to that preparation on the 4th day of January, 1918, over a year ago, I introduced a joint resolution in the Senate. My resolution was framed upon entirely different lines from those of the Senator from Iowa. His resolution, as the Senate knows, provides for joint committees between the House and Senate composed of Members of the House and Senate. My resolution provides for a commission to be appointed by the President of the United States. I had no hesitation about making a provision of that kind. I had no lack of confidence in the President doing what he thought would be the right thing in the selection of that commission. I did not provide for a committee of Congress or of the Senate largely for the reason that I did not believe we could expect very much from such a committee.



The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] suggested awhile ago the difficulty of getting committee meetings. That has been true all during this Congress. It has not been confined to the period of the war, but during the time our Democratic friends have been in control of the Senate it has been very difficult to get meetings of the committees and to get a quorum present, especially a quorum of the majority. Many of our bills must be reported by polling the committees and with no consideration at all.

Furthermore, whatever is done along the line of the objects of the two resolutions should be done promptly and should be done thoroughly. Every Senator is busy with matters from his State, from his constituents, and in connection with other legislative matters in which the people of the country are interested. They do not have the time to make the investigation, in my judgment, that ought to be made in order to determine what should be done to meet these problems. They would not have the time to study the problems and study the solution of them and propose them to Congress. They would not attend the meetings. This and that would interfere and the result would be that two or three would attend, a great mass of testimony would be taken, long essays would be read, and nothing would be accomplished.

It seemed to me if we would have a commission composed of men with practical experience in business affairs and who would devote their entire time and all their energy and ability to studying these problems, we were very likely to get some results. So, Mr. President, on the 4th day of January, 1918, I introduced a joint resolution that authorizes and directs the President of the United States to appoint a commission composed of 27 individuals, and I wish to call attention to the way I provided in the resolution that the commission should be composed.

The 27 members were to serve for a period of six months, but the term of service could be extended another six months if the President thought it advisable and necessary to have it done. What I hoped to get was as early a report as possible from such a commission. I hoped that the commission would go right to work, and, as I said awhile ago, give all its time and all its energy to the study of these problems and report just as soon as possible.

I provided that three members of such a commission should be experienced representatives of the manufacturing industries of the country. I do not care anything about their politics. I did not care anything about where they should come from. I simply wanted them to represent certain lines of industry throughout the country. I wanted them to be men of experience in a practical way along the various lines of business activity, and that was the only restriction I imposed upon the President in the selection of the members.

I provided that three members should be experienced representatives of the commercial interests of the country, that three members should be experienced representatives of the agricultural interests of the country, and three should be experienced representatives of the transportation interests of the country. All these interests, of course, are involved in the problems of peace. They were all more or less disturbed or deranged by the necessities of war. Men experienced in them could better suggest remedies to meet any ills in these operations than anyone else.

Then I provided that three members thereof should be experienced representatives of the shipping, fishing, and other marine interests of the country; three members should be experienced representatives of the mining industry of the country; three members should be experienced representatives of the export and import business of the country; three members should be experienced representatives of the banking and financial interests of the country; and three members should be experienced representatives of labor.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that I have provided representation on behalf of all of the leading interests and industries of the country upon this commission. I believe we could have gotten results from it if the resolution had been passed a little over a year ago. We should have had by this time a report from it of value not only in the material and information gathered but in the recommendations made by such a commission.

Then I provided, of course, for stenographic work, for compensation, and so on.

That resolution went to the committee, but apparently no consideration was given to it; no action was taken upon it. A few months ago the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] introduced his resolution, and it was referred to a Republican conference. I was not able to attend that conference, and so I did not have an opportunity to call the attention

of the conference to the resolution which I had introduced. Personally, however, I should much prefer a resolution along the lines I suggested to the resolution of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I believe we would get better results from it; I believe we would get quicker results from it and something more satisfactory to Congress; but I am willing to support any measure that gives hope of results. As I said, it ought to have been done a long time ago. I do not know whether much can be accomplished now. It takes time to work out these things. These problems are right on us now. If my resolution had been passed when introduced, we would be ready now to legislate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will.

Mr. KING. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, and other instrumentalities and agencies of the Government have made a very thorough investigation of the subjects—if not all, of most, at least, of the subjects—referred to in the resolution just read by the Senator. They have accumulated a vast amount of information. I know that surveys have been made of many of the lines of activity, statistics have been obtained, and a great deal of information which bears upon the industrial, economic, and, indeed, the entire social structure by these various organizations to which I have referred, and it is available now for the congressional committees.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no doubt that they have gathered a good deal of information, but they have not gathered it with the particular purpose and object in view of giving it consideration at the time it was gathered and of applying it to the needs of the hour. They are not prepared to submit to Congress specific, concrete recommendations as to what will meet this situation or that situation. No doubt they obtained an abundance of information, and it could be brought up here, of course, and could be considered by committees; but, if we had had a commission like this, it would have gathered all this information; it would have gathered it with the very thought in mind of determining from it what would be necessary and what could be done to meet these various problems, and it would be ready with concrete recommendations to submit to Congress.

But these other bodies have apparently not done it. We have no recommendations from any executive branch of the Government with reference to any specific problem that we must meet or in reference to any specific concrete problem already worked out and how to solve it.

I am not going to discuss the general propositions which have been submitted and urged upon us and that ought to be worked out. There seem to be, as I noticed in the newspapers this morning, three or four distinct propositions which have been urged before various bodies of Congress by those representing the administration, and it has been urged that legislative action upon these propositions is imperatively necessary. One of them is the matter of the next liberty loan. The Secretary of the Treasury says that he ought to have certain legislation; that it should be passed at once, although the liberty loan is not coming on until April. He says that Congress will not be in session, and he needs to have a blanket delegation of power that he may meet particular situations when they arise a month or two from now. He says we do not know now what the conditions will be, and so he thinks we should turn the matter over to him and go home.

Mr. President, the matters referred to in the newspapers this morning are sufficient to warrant the calling of the next Congress in extraordinary session on the 5th day of March. It ought to be called. We ought to start the work upon these things, instead of delegating to administrative officers the power and the authority to do the things that are peculiarly legislative in their character. Congress ought to be called together to discharge its duties and its responsibilities. Congress ought to go to work upon the problems which the Secretary of the Interior says it is essential to solve soon; Congress ought to be called soon to work out and meet the problems that the Secretary of the Treasury says ought to be met and must be met; Congress ought to be ready to go to work upon the railroad and transportation problems that everybody concedes ought to be worked out soon.

Mr. President, in my judgment it will be a shirking of the responsibilities of government if Congress is not called in early session to work out and solve these problems that everybody concedes must be solved in a legislative way, or else blanket authority be given to administrative officers to solve them. I do not like to stay here in session myself; but, Mr. President, the responsibilities and duties which should be discharged by Congress are higher than the pleasure of Senators. These things, in my judgment, should come first. The President should not hesitate a moment about calling Congress together



Just as soon as possible after the 4th of March, in order that we may organize and go to work on these problems. We are ready to do it. We want to help him meet the Nation's needs. Does he want our help? He should welcome our aid and counsel. We are ready for real teamwork. We do not want to act as Republicans; I do not want to work on these matters in a partisan way; we ought to work on these problems as representatives of the people, as American patriots, trying to do what is best for the interests of the country and the industries of the country. Everybody recognizes that there are peculiar situations confronting us and that are likely to confront us. They are situations that can be met only by Congress, under the leadership of the administrative officers of the Government. Congress should be here, and I believe that Congress is ready to come here and act upon all these matters in a nonpartisan way, with the sole desire to do what is best for the interests of the country. I am speaking for no one but myself, but if the President will give us the opportunity we will show him that our partisanship will be subordinated to our patriotism, and we will give him our best effort and our best ability to serve our common country and promote its welfare.

#### WEARING OF UNIFORM BY DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, during the course of the debate to-day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] made charges against the Department of Justice, and particularly against the Attorney General, which, if true, would justify the conclusion which he reached and the very serious arraignment which he made of that department. I do not see the Senator from Michigan in the Chamber, and if he is about the Senate I should like to have him summoned in order that he may hear the statement I am about to make.

I have before me the record of the address made by the Senator from Michigan. On page 2 of the stenographer's notes of that address he said:

This morning I am informed that under the directions of the Attorney General soldiers returning from abroad are being arrested in the city of Detroit for wearing their uniforms one day after they have returned, and an appeal made to the War Department says the War Department has nothing to do with the matter.

Further along in his address the notes show that he said:

Oh, Mr. President, has it come to pass that a soldier who has honored his uniform by fighting the battles of his country can not wear that uniform home with him?

And, again, the notes show that he said:

He may wear his uniform under the law from the scene of his military activities to his home not exceeding the period of 90 days. The War Department holds that he has a right to wear his uniform 90 days even around home, and the Department of Justice are hunting down these soldiers and prosecuting them and placing them under arrest, I am informed, only yesterday in the city of Detroit.

Again, the notes of his address show that he said:

The War Department takes that view, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, but the Department of Justice takes a directly opposite view, and in the enforcement of the law the Department of Justice has a wider and more important function than the War Department. \* \* \* I do not want to pursue the matter any further. I am humiliated and saddened to think that any department of the Government would exercise this technical or arbitrary power and deprive soldiers of the uniform.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to quote many other similar statements reported in the notes of the speech made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, the Senator correctly stated the law on the subject; and I ask leave, in connection with my remarks, to put in the RECORD section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The section referred to is as follows:

Sec. 125. Protection of the uniform: It shall be unlawful for any person not an officer or enlisted man of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, to wear the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or any distinctive part of such uniform, or a uniform any part of which is similar to a distinctive part of the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not be construed so as to prevent officers or enlisted men of the National Guard from wearing, in pursuance of law and regulations, the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by such officers or enlisted men of the National Guard; nor to prevent members of the organization known as the Boy Scouts of America, or the Naval Militia, or such other organizations as the Secretary of War may designate, from wearing their prescribed uniforms; nor to prevent persons who in time of war have served honorably as officers of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, and whose most recent service was terminated by an honorable discharge, muster out, or resignation, from wearing, upon occasions of ceremony, the uniform of the highest grade they have held by brevet or other commission in such Regular or Volunteer service; nor to prevent any person who has been honorably discharged from the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing his uniform from the place of his discharge to his home, within three months after the date of such discharge; nor to prevent the members of military societies composed entirely of honorably discharged officers or enlisted men, or

both, of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing, upon occasions of ceremony, the uniform duly prescribed by such societies to be worn by the members thereof; nor to prevent the instructors and members of the duly organized cadet corps of a State university, State college, or public high school offering a regular course in military instruction from wearing the uniform duly prescribed by the authorities of such university, college, or public high school for wear by the instructors and members of such cadet corps; nor to prevent the instructors and members of the duly organized cadet corps of any other institution of learning offering a regular course in military instruction, and at which an officer or enlisted man of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is lawfully detailed for duty as instructor in military science and tactics, from wearing the uniform duly prescribed by the authorities of such institution of learning for wear by the instructors and members of such cadet corps; nor to prevent civilians attendant upon a course of military or naval instruction authorized and conducted by the military or naval authorities of the United States from wearing, while in attendance upon such course of instruction, the uniform authorized and prescribed by such military or naval authorities for wear during such course of instruction; nor to prevent any person from wearing the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in any playhouse or theater or in moving-picture films while actually engaged in representing therein a military or naval character not tending to bring discredit or reproach upon the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the uniforms worn by officers or enlisted men of the National Guard, or by the members of the military societies or the instructors and members of the cadet corps referred to in the preceding proviso shall include some distinctive mark or insignia to be prescribed by the Secretary of War to distinguish such uniforms from the uniforms of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps: *And provided further*, That the members of the military societies and the instructors and members of the cadet corps hereinbefore mentioned shall not wear the insignia of rank prescribed to be worn by officers of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or any insignia of rank similar thereto.

Any person who offends against the provisions of this section shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$300, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. ROBINSON. It will be noted that among the exceptions forbidding the use of the United States military uniform by anyone other than officers or enlisted men is contained the following:

nor to prevent any person who has been honorably discharged from the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing his uniform from the place of his discharge to his home within three months after the date of such discharge.

The War Department has construed that paragraph in one decision, and only one decision, I am informed by high authorities in that department. That decision is as follows:

An officer or enlisted man, under a reasonable construction of section 125 of the national defense act (39 Stat., 166, 217), should proceed from the place of his honorable discharge to his home with reasonable speed, and upon his arrival there his uniform should be discarded, as it is unlawful for him to wear it longer. In no event should he take more than three months, and he may not unduly protract his transit. (Ops. J. A. G. 421, Sept. 9, 1918.)

On January 25 the War Department issued a circular in connection with the right of discharged officers and men to wear their uniforms. That circular is signed by Peyton C. March, general, Chief of Staff. I ask that that also be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator read it, instead of having it inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I will read it. It is as follows:

Circular No. 43.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C.

#### WEARING OF UNIFORM BY DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

Present law authorizes a discharged officer or soldier to wear his uniform from the place of discharge to his home, within three months of the date of his discharge from the service. Thereafter the officer may wear his uniform only upon occasions of ceremony.

The enlisted man must return his uniform within four months of date of discharge; but can wear it only as stated above.

An act is now before Congress which, if passed, will authorize enlisted men to keep the uniform which they are permitted to wear home, and to wear that particular uniform only, provided some distinctive mark or insignia, to be issued by the War Department, shall be worn.

It will thus be clearly seen that neither under existing or proposed law will a discharged soldier be permitted to wear uniforms made by civilian or other tailors. They may legally wear only the particular uniform which they have been permitted to retain.

Commanding officers of camps, posts, and stations will give the widest publicity to this information, both among the soldiers of their commands and in the local press. No person will be permitted to solicit orders for or deliver uniforms to soldiers about to be discharged. Persons or concerns persisting in selling uniforms to such soldiers, after having been warned not to do so, will not be permitted to come on or do business on the reservation.

By order of the Secretary of War:

PEYTON C. MARCH,  
General, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. C. HARRIS,  
The Adjutant General.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to be sure whether the order says "three months from the time of discharge" or "three months after arriving at home." There seems to be a misunderstanding.



ing about that, and I should like the Senator to read that portion of the circular again, if he will.

Mr. ROBINSON. I can state it; my knowledge of it is accurate, I am sure. The law is—and the construction made by the department is to the same effect—that a uniform can only be worn 90 days from the date of discharge.

Mr. SMOOT. Whether the soldier is home or on the way from the place of discharge to his home?

Mr. ROBINSON. There is another limitation in the law which was passed for which I respectfully suggest to Senators neither the Department of Justice nor the War Department is directly responsible. That limitation is that the soldier may only wear his uniform while proceeding to his home from the place of discharge. I agree with the implied suggestion of the Senator from Michigan that such a statute ought to be construed liberally and that men in the attempt to conform to the statute ought to be given the benefit of every doubt.

An inquiry was instituted by some of us who felt that, if statements made by the Senator from Michigan are well founded, then conditions are utterly appalling. That investigation disclosed the real facts; and I very much regret that the Senator from Michigan is not present to hear my statement, for I believe that, if he were present, he would realize that he has done a gross injustice to a high officer of this Government, the Attorney General of the United States, and has also done a gross injustice to the Department of Justice.

The facts are, Mr. President, that there is only one case on record where a discharged soldier has been arrested in the district referred to by the Senator from Michigan, and I think that is probably the only case on record; in any event, it must be the case which he had in mind. The record shows that in that case two discharged soldiers, falsely representing themselves to be in the service of the United States and in the performance of their duty, while wearing the uniform of United States soldiers, were importing, in violation of the so-called Reed amendment, a large quantity of liquor into the State of Michigan. They resisted search and claimed that they were acting for and on behalf of their superior officers. They also claimed that the liquor was Government property. An investigation was instituted. That statement was found to be untrue, and they were indicted for unlawfully wearing the uniform of United States soldiers and for violating the liquor laws of the United States. If the Senator from Michigan or any other Senator thinks that the conduct of those soldiers while wearing the uniform of the United States is protected by the statute which we wrote, a statute designed to preserve the integrity of the uniform of United States soldiers, he is welcome to his conclusion; but any criticism that he might make of anyone for arresting and punishing those men would have no consideration with me.

The facts are that after these men were arrested they went into a court and pleaded guilty to violating the liquor laws, and guilty, too, of unlawfully wearing the uniform, which, under their own statement, they had disgraced.

I need not argue to Senators that it is the purpose of the law to protect the brave and glorious men who have worn and are wearing our uniform from the contumely and disgrace which these two soldiers, by pleas of "guilty," admitted they had brought to it.

Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Michigan to the effect that the Department of Justice was placing one construction on this law and the War Department a different one, and that a violent clash of authority had arisen, is, in my judgment, totally unfounded. This is the only case known, according to the verbal statement of officers in the War Department, where soldiers have been arrested for violating the statute directed against unlawfully wearing the uniform. The War Department does not contend that a man who is in the bootlegging business can shield himself by wearing a soldier's uniform. No lawyer will contend that the construction of the statute made by the Department of Justice and by the United States attorney for the district in which these arrests were made, is unfair, unreasonable, or unjust.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], while I was absent from the Chamber, made a statement concerning this subject which I have read in which I heartily concur. Both he and I took up the matter with the Department of Justice. I felt that if the Attorney General had ordered his agents throughout the United States, to arrest men the day after they have returned from fighting the battles of this country in France because they are wearing the uniform—if he is arresting them the day after they are discharged, before they have an opportunity to return to their homes—the severest action which the laws of this country will justify should be taken against him. I am not willing that a charge of this sort should be made politics of; neither is

the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and neither I trust is any other Senator.

The Senator from Michigan said that it is the custom and practice, the ordinary procedure, of the Department of Justice to arrest men in Detroit for unlawfully wearing the uniform the day after they have returned from France and the day after they have been discharged. The facts developed are that these men were out of the Army; they were engaged in an unlawful business; they were seeking to carry on that business under the guise of being soldiers. Can the glory of the United States Army, can the name of the Senator from Michigan, or can the name of Michigan itself be advanced in the minds of honest men by unfounded statements like that made by the Senator from Michigan?

I will read this telegram bearing upon the subject:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Detroit, Mich., February 15, 1919.

JOHN LORD O'BRIEN,  
Special Assistant to Attorney General,  
Washington:

Re telephone conversation this date, there have been no arrests in this district for unlawfully wearing uniform after discharge except where used as a means of committing crime, and but one case of this character, where two discharged soldiers were unlawfully bringing several gallons whiskey into Michigan in violation of Reed amendment and resisted search, falsely claiming to be in military service and on duty, and that baggage was property of superior officer and Government property and exempt from search by State officials; indicted for violation of Reed amendment and unlawful wearing of uniform; plead guilty to both charges; fined \$150 on first and \$50 on second charge; both paid. No other arrests in this district for unlawfully wearing uniform after discharge, and none authorized or contemplated. Any statement to contrary absolutely without foundation.

KINNANE, United States Attorney.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator might have stated that one of these men had been discharged from the Army for more than nine months; the other had been discharged from the service for more than two months and a half. Both of them had ceased wearing the uniform, had discarded it, and confessed that they put on their uniforms that morning to aid them in their unlawful efforts to convey liquor, in violation of law, from Ohio into the State of Michigan.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to state that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] went to his home on account of illness. He has been quite poorly of late. I feel perfectly safe in saying that if the Senator from Michigan had been fully advised of the conditions surrounding the case as presented by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], I am quite sure he never would have even thought of calling it to the attention of the Senate. When the statement was made, I could not conceive of such a thing happening anywhere in the United States; and yet the Senator had directly by wire the statement made by a man in whom he had absolute confidence, and giving the details as he stated they were.

I will simply remark at this time that it only shows how people throughout the country will hear a thing, jump at a conclusion, and immediately take action, without due consideration.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what his program is. Are we going ahead with the river and harbor bill to-night, or will the Senator move a recess at this time?

Mr. FLETCHER. I wanted to make a statement with reference to an item in the bill to which the Senator from Iowa had made some objection before taking a recess to-night. After that, I shall be willing to take a recess. It will take but a very few minutes.

Mr. KENYON. We are up to the Oklawaha River item now.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Oklawaha River—that is where we are in the bill.

Mr. KENYON. I shall take up some time on that item.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida if it is his purpose to take a recess in the course of half an hour?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we shall be able to do so; yes.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill yield for a moment? I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. FRANCE. I was called out of the Chamber, and I did not have an opportunity to ask the Senator with reference to the appropriation of \$9,000 on page 8 for dredging in the Balti-



more district. I desire to inquire if the engineer considered that that sum would be sufficient to take care of all of the work contemplated and mentioned on page 7, including the Elk River?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will state to the Senator that the engineer informed us that he could take care of the Elk River under that provision, and that the amount mentioned in the bill would be sufficient to maintain those projects during the year. There is an amount to the credit of the projects, and we added the amount of \$9,000 there, as the Senator will see, which was considered ample to take care of that project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 6, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$108,000" and insert "\$113,000; continuing improvement between Jacksonville and the ocean, \$125,000"; so as to read:

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, opposite the city of Jacksonville, Jacksonville to Palatka, and Palatka to Lake Harney, Lake Crescent, and Dunn's Creek, and Oklawaha River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$113,000; continuing improvement between Jacksonville and the ocean, \$125,000; for improvement between Jacksonville and Palatka, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the project for this section shall be extended by the Secretary of War in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 699, Sixty-third Congress, second session: *Provided further*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Florida desired to make a statement upon the next amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is there any objection anywhere to the items in the St. John River? Then, the next item is the Oklawaha River.

Mr. KENYON. That is the one we wanted to discuss.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is the first amendment in that paragraph agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Which one is that?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the St. Johns River amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that.

Mr. KENYON. That is all right.

Mr. FLETCHER. That brings us down to line 15, "for improvement of Oklawaha River."

Mr. President, the Oklawaha River project is a new project. It never has been adopted by Congress. It is, however, a project which has been favorably reported on by the engineers. The district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, a special board of engineers sent down for the purpose of making an investigation on the ground regarding the project, and the Chief of Engineers have all favorably reported it to Congress. It also was favorably considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1914, reported to the House, and passed by the House. It came over here and in one of the bills it was favorably reported by the Commerce Committee, and would undoubtedly have passed before this and have been approved by both branches of Congress except for the fact that we made a lump-sum appropriation which took the place of the river and harbor bill which had that item in it. So it has gone through all the steps necessary to establish its merit. It has been passed upon by all agencies and officers and committees, and even by the House of Representatives, and I have no doubt would have been indorsed here as I said, and would have been approved and gone into law before this time except for the fact that we were unable to pass the river and harbor bill which had that item in it. I may be mistaken as to having substituted a lump-sum appropriation. I think that was the bill which did not pass Congress at all, but failed, as did other large appropriation bills at that session of Congress. The Post Office appropriation bill, the naval appropriation bill, and the Army appropriation bill among others failed that year, as the Senate will remember, on account of action which prevented further legislation. That bill contained this item, but the river and harbor bill, as I said, failed, as did all the other large appropriation bills that session. For that reason it has never been brought before the Senate for final action. It has passed the House.

Subsequent to the bill that failed, the Senate will remember we had been confining our appropriations to war-emergency matters as far as new projects were concerned and to maintenance and to continuing appropriations to carry on projects already adopted. We have not claimed it was a war-emergency proposition. We do claim that upon the basis of transportation, upon the basis of improving highways in order to promote commerce,

this project ought to be adopted by Congress and this improvement ought to be made.

Generally speaking, let me say the St. Johns River, as is well known, flows into the Atlantic Ocean, and the Oklawaha River flows into the St. Johns River about 120 miles from its mouth. It therefore is not a mere intrastate stream. It is connected with New York. The cities and towns on the banks of the Oklawaha River and at the head of the Oklawaha are in communication with all of the great cities on the Atlantic seaboard, as far as that is concerned. The river has been navigable all the time, so far as we know. Boats have been able to operate upon it, but there is need of greater depth. For 32 miles of the river they have a depth now of 6 feet, for 4 miles of about 5 feet, and then for 94 miles the depth is varying all the way from 3 to 5 and 6 feet, but the channel is very crooked and the depth is not dependable. It can not be estimated at certain seasons of the year that they will have even that much water throughout the length of the entire stretch of the river.

The Oklawaha River, as I said, empties into the St. Johns River about 20 miles south of Palatka and the main run extends up to what is called Silver Springs Run, an immense body, in which springs an ordinary boat can be turned around. A river fairly bubbles out of the ground, affording one branch of the Oklawaha River. The water is 50 or 60 feet in depth in this spring and perfectly clear. The branch, however, which is under consideration here is the branch leading from 4 miles below Silver Springs in the direction southward toward Leesburg. Before it reaches Leesburg it reaches Lake Griffin, which is some 8 miles across. There will be need of a lock at Lake Griffin in order to control the water and to assure a steady flow of water with an ample depth throughout the stream at all seasons of the year.

Lake Griffin leads to Leesburg, and the Leesburg local interests undertake to connect Lake Griffin with Lake Harris, another large lake, connected with which is Lake Eustis and Lake Dora. So you have a chain in a region which is surrounded by orange groves, truck farms, and various other industries, among them kaolin mining and manufacturing and pulp and various other enterprises, which would all be accommodated by the improvement of the Oklawaha River.

The project is to give a channel 6 feet in depth, which is described in paragraph 5 of the report of the Chief of Engineers, as follows:

5. After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in general with the views of the district officer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the improvement by the United States of Oklawaha River from its mouth to Lake Dora is deemed advisable to the extent of obtaining a channel 6 feet deep and 60 feet wide, in the manner contemplated by the district officer, and with locks of dimensions as proposed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, at an estimated cost of \$733,000 for original construction and \$12,000 per annum for maintenance, subject to the conditions of local cooperation recommended by the board and quoted above. The first appropriation should be \$175,000, with subsequent appropriations sufficient to complete the work in four years.

The bill carries \$100,000 for the project. It would, of course, adopt the project and would mean that the Government would undertake to complete that improvement. The report further shows the amount of commerce and the value of this improvement, but since the report was furnished there has been a tremendous development along the route of the river. The Oklawaha Valley is one of the richest valleys in the whole country. There are twenty-odd thousand acres of land along this stretch of the river from Lake Griffin toward Silver Springs Run of ninety-odd miles—20,000 acres of as rich land as can be found in the country. Since this report was made over a thousand acres of that land have been put in cultivation and it produces according to statements made to me, 100 bushels of corn per acre per annum and 200 bushels of potatoes per acre per annum, and both corn and potatoes the same year. There is not anything finer in the country. There is no speculation about it. They are the actual results. That produce has to be hauled from 8 to 12 miles to the railroad and then to the market North. All that produce would move through this waterway if the channel were deep enough and straightened sufficiently to permit of it.

I have here a letter from Mr. Gilbert D. Leach, who has been very much interested in this subject and who represented the chamber of commerce at the time of the Atlantic Deep Waterways Convention at its meeting at Miami a year or two ago. The committee, of which Mr. Leach was a member, appeared before the members of that convention and urged that they favor this project. At any rate, Mr. Leach has been thoroughly familiar with all the conditions there. He is the editor of the Leesburg Commercial. Under date of January 20, 1919, he writes me as follows. I will ask to have the whole letter in-



corporated in the RECORD, but I wish particularly to refer to this part of it:

You have in your committee room a long picture of a thousand-acre cornfield at Mucian Farms, on the Oklawaha River, at the county line between Lake and Marion Counties. That same field, in response to the call for more foodstuffs, was planted in Irish potatoes, and actually produced, in round numbers, I was informed by the manager, 200,000 bushels of spuds. Of this immense quantity of potatoes about 60,000 bushels were marketed. The remainder rotted in the fields.

Now, why? Because to gather the potatoes, pack and prepare them for shipment, and haul them 8 or 10 miles to the railroad and pay the freight on them from there to market involved so much expense that they could not sell them. They offered them at \$1 a bushel down at Jacksonville. They could not get them to market. It is a pity, it is a shame, when we are urging people to produce food in this country that on these lands the food can be produced, and is produced, and the produce should rot in the field because of the excessive freight charges to market and the lack of water facilities to get it to market.

There being no objection, the letter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEESBURG, FLA., January 29, 1919.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 16th was most welcome. I felt confident you would bring up the project when the bill reached your committee.

Naturally, the development along the valley of the Oklawaha and the valley of the St. Johns has been arrested during the war, for these are a patriotic people, and they have not tried to encourage new settlers to ride on Mr. McAdoo's trains against his wishes. However, the call of the Department of Agriculture for greater production of foodstuffs caused increased acreage to be used all through that section, and the deplorable fate of one of the most important responses to that call I want to recite to you.

You have in your committee room a long picture of a thousand-acre cornfield at Mucian Farms, on the Oklawaha River, at the county line between Lake and Marion Counties. That same field, in response to the call for more foodstuffs, was planted in Irish potatoes, and actually produced, in round numbers, I was informed by the manager, 200,000 bushels of spuds.

Of this immense quantity of potatoes about 60,000 bushels were marketed. The remainder rotted in the fields.

Why?

Because the water was too low to barge them from the field on the Oklawaha River to Jacksonville, where contractors under the Government were bringing northern potatoes into Jacksonville for less freight than the railroads charged to carry them from the Oklawaha Valley to Jacksonville, and because the railroads would pay no attention to them. There was no market because it cost so much to get them there that the price would have been prohibitive. Yet here was the river draining the fields in which these potatoes were growing and flowing on right past the very cantonment where thousands of soldiers were eating potatoes brought more than a thousand miles by rail. Accompanying this are two exhibits clipped from the Commercial of June 28, 1918. The advertisement, as you see, offers the finest potatoes at a dollar a hamper. Contractors at Jacksonville were paying, I understand, \$2.35 for old potatoes at that time. The combination of refusal to buy of Florida growers, lack of cars, and immense freight rates doomed the growers of these potatoes, and they lost the money they had spent for seed.

There is, as you know, about 21,000 acres of this rich muck land in one body, every acre of it capable of producing 100 bushels of corn or 200 bushels of potatoes to the acre every year without fertilizer. If water transportation is furnished through the Oklawaha, so that barge haul will place the produce aboard vessels in the harbor at Jacksonville, this one area of land can answer the call for greater "food, feed, and forage" to the tune of 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes and 2,000,000 bushels of corn per annum. And by "per annum" I mean both the same year.

During the past two years citrus fruit groves have been planted in this valley, particularly around Lakes Griffin and Harris. Between Lake Griffin, in which the Oklawaha begins as a river, and Silver Lake there is a new development of grove property that is to be 10,000 acres when completed. Several hundred acres are already set out and more are to follow as rapidly as the work can be accomplished. The rate on citrus fruit from Leesburg to Jacksonville is 2½ cents per box, and to this must be added a 6-mile haul by automobile truck. If the Oklawaha were improved, this fruit could go to Jacksonville by barge line direct from the groves.

At Emerald Island, Lake Griffin, a new situation has developed this season. This is a great fruit-producing section with hundreds of acres of groves that bear enormously. So great has been the traffic by automobile truck carrying fruit to Leesburg from Emerald Island this winter, especially when coupled with the unusually rainy winter we have had, that the road is cut to pieces. Some of this crop has had to be brought across the lake to Leesburg by makeshift water transportation (the fact that the river is too shallow for water craft making regular boat transportation on single lakes unprofitable, and therefore taking the boats away from this work) and this has cost an average of 9 cents per box. Add to this the 2½ cents per box from Leesburg to Jacksonville and you can see how discouraging it is to growers of fruits.

There is another new proposition of an industrial nature that is going to need transportation on the Oklawaha very badly. Plans are drawn and site selected for a pulp mill on the Lake Griffin Canal, paper and box-board pulp to be manufactured from sawgrass which grows in the edge of the lakes and along the banks of the river. Rights to harvest sawgrass on more than 10,000 acres of land have already been secured in the name of the Leesburg Board of Trade for the use of those who are erecting the paper mill, and it is the intention of the people who will own the mill to make this the permanent manufacturing point for finer grades of paper. As the Government has been dealing with the paper question for the past two years, and as this industry will convert a waste product into the finest grade of papyrus writing paper as well as many coarser varieties of paper, this is an industry that should be encouraged. The first mill is to turn out 10 tons daily, but will be so erected that its capacity can be increased to

50 tons daily without enlarging the buildings. To run the larger mill it will require incoming transportation of about 200 tons of raw material daily, besides the wood for fuel, and the finished product resulting will be 50 tons daily, which should be given water transportation to Jacksonville, the nearest basic freight point and the nearest ship harbor. Freight by rail for the raw materials or for wood fuel is out of the question for this industry. If the Oklawaha is improved all of this waste product from the mouth of the St. Johns to the end of the project in Lake Dora can be utilized economically and manufactured into a finished product that the country sadly needs. Without the Oklawaha improvement this industry must of necessity be circumscribed by the limitations of transportation of the raw materials and it can produce and manufacture only a limited amount of this high-grade paper so badly needed, the remainder of the waste product continuing to be waste as it has in the past. As this sawgrass renews itself in about six months after being harvested a practically inexhaustible supply of raw material will be made available where now the same quality of paper must be made of rags with a limited amount of wood fiber added. To the United States, as a whole, the benefits from this one industry here at the source of the Oklawaha River will far more than offset the first cost and maintenance of the complete Oklawaha project. Both the quality and the practicability of the utilization of sawgrass have been thoroughly demonstrated.

These are the new elements of our request for improvement of this river. The old, old facts and figures still maintain as recited to both the House and your committee of the Senate in 1916. Our need is becoming more acute and only the fact that we are not a wealthy people has kept us waiting for the slow action of the Federal Government in giving this matter the attention your United States Engineering Department asked for it eight years ago.

With the hope that these facts will assist you in presenting anew the proposition that means so much to this section of the country, I submit them with the utmost respect and regards.

Very truly, yours,

GILBERT D. LEACH.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, there is no guess about this sort of thing. This has been the actual experience of these people. To be sure, the Food Administration gave out orders that people were to buy old potatoes and not new potatoes. There was a quartermaster's training camp at Jacksonville, 125 miles from these fields, buying potatoes sent down from Maine, a thousand miles by water. They were buying those potatoes while these potatoes were offered to them at \$1 a bushel, and, as I said, were permitted to rot in the field on these lands adjoining this river. If they had had barges with a sufficient depth of water to take them out of this river to the St. Johns River and then on down to Jacksonville by the St. Johns River, they could have been put into that market at half the railroad rate besides saving the immense expense and trouble of trucking and hauling them 8 or 10 miles by road to get them to the railroad.

The same situation exists with regard to fruit. There are thousands of acres of the finest fruit groves in the world adjacent to this river on the banks of these immense lakes, which would all be reached by the improvement of this river. The local interests will connect Lake Griffin with Lake Harris in order to connect up all the lakes of that region. All that region would be opened up and given water transportation to the markets of the world through this connection with the St. Johns River to the Atlantic Ocean.

That is the situation. Here is a stretch of 94 miles of very crooked, wandering river that in certain seasons of the year is very shallow and is not dependable, and at the head of it there are these vast bodies of waters. I would call them vast, because Lake Griffin is 8 or 10 miles in diameter. Lake Eustis is a large lake, and just beyond that is Lake Apopka, covering hundreds of acres; then Lake Dora, and along the shores of these lakes there are the most beautiful groves to be found in all the world. The larger portion of that fruit would move through this waterway.

I shall not go into further details to-day. I will ask Senators to please read the report on this project, Document No. 514, and to keep in mind that it is a project which has been indorsed by all the agencies and authorities whose duty it was to investigate it, including the special board sent down there for the purpose of going over and making an examination on the ground, that it has passed both the committees of Congress heretofore, that it has passed the House of Representatives, and would have passed, I have no doubt, if that bill had not failed as all the appropriation bills failed two years ago.

I sincerely hope that this improvement will not be longer delayed, because it means, by lack of expenditure of a comparatively small sum of money, not affording the facilities which would promote the commerce of that region and add to the transportation possibilities. It would mean not merely a local matter at all, but would mean the development of the whole region in that vicinity and add to the commerce of the whole country. The citrus fruit packers would move out along this river to the markets of the country. It means not merely a benefit to the citrus fruit growers. If the corn and potatoes that are produced there can move to market, it means not merely a benefit to the people who grow the corn and potatoes in those fields. If there is any project at all that deserves the



favorable consideration of Congress in this whole bill, I think this is the project. I shall have something further to say about it if there is occasion to do so.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall ask that after the executive session the Senate shall recess until 11 o'clock Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the motion is put, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I have just sent to the Document Room for Document No. 514, and there is not a single copy there. Has the Senator two copies, that I may have one to-night?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; the Senator can be furnished with a copy.

Mr. RANDELL. The only copy we have is in this book, which we shall be glad to lend to the Senator from Utah if he wishes it.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask the Senator from Colorado to withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

#### SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. This afternoon the Committee on Privileges and Elections authorized me to present a substitute for Senate resolution 415 relating to the Michigan senatorial contest. I ask to have it incorporated in the Record for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] just before leaving asked me in case the Senator from Ohio presented the substitute to-night to request him to leave it until Monday morning.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not going to ask for any action upon it. I simply want to have it printed in the Record for the information of Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose there will be no objection to that. The Senator from Michigan thought the Senator might desire action upon it.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no; I do not ask for action to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The substitute reported by Mr. POMERENE is as follows:

Whereas charges and countercharges of excessive expenditure of money and of unlawful practices have been made in connection with the election of a Senator from the State of Michigan, and it has been reported that certain evidence in connection therewith is liable to be lost or destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and empowered—

(a) To take possession in the presence of the representatives of Messrs. Newberry and Ford, through the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and preserve all ballots, poll books, and tally sheets. The committee may also in like manner take possession of and preserve any other documentary evidence in connection with such charges or countercharges which it is shown to a majority of the committee, a quorum being present, or to a majority of any subcommittee acting in the matter, is in danger of otherwise being lost or destroyed before the meeting of the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress, said ballots, documentary evidence, etc., to be sealed and held for such use as the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress may determine.

(b) To take and preserve any relevant, competent, and material verbal testimony where it is shown to a majority of the committee, a quorum being present, or to a majority of any subcommittee acting in the matter, that any witness can not reasonably be expected to be available as a witness if called before a committee of the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

(c) To issue and enforce any necessary subpoenas, to sit during the session of the Senate, or during any recess of the Senate, at such place or places as it may deem most convenient for the purpose of carrying out the intent of this resolution.

(d) To compel the production of papers, books, or documents for the purposes herein contemplated.

The expenses incurred in the carrying out of this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers ordered by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, and approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE subsequently said:

Mr. President, in order to avoid confusion, I ask that the substitute for Senate resolution 415, relating to the Michigan senatorial contest, be printed as an amendment to the original resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 17, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of February 13), 1919.*

#### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Henry James Holmes to be receiver of public moneys at Glenwood Springs, Colo.

Robert J. McGrath to be receiver of public moneys at Lamar, Colo.

#### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Dallas C. Weyand to be register of land office at Glenwood Springs, Colo.

Alonzo L. Beavers to be register of land office at Lamar, Colo.

Edward J. Hoefnagels to be register of the land office at Leadville, Colo.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Edwin A. Anderson to be a rear admiral.

Capt. Charles W. Dyson to be a rear admiral.

Commander Douglas E. Dismukes to be a captain.

The following-named commanders to be captains:

Edward H. Campbell and

Martin E. Trench.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Henry C. Dinger,

James H. Comfort,

William V. Tomb,

George B. Landenberger,

William Norris, and

Harold E. Cook.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Aubrey W. Fitch,

Robert V. Lowe,

John B. Rhodes,

Robert A. Theobald,

Guy E. Baker,

William F. Newton,

Frank N. Eklund,

Willis W. Bradley, jr.,

Earle F. Johnson, and

Henry K. Hewitt.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Howard B. Berry,

Virgil C. Griffin, jr.,

Ernest G. Small,

Andrew C. Bennett,

William D. Taylor,

Robert R. Thompson,

Albert B. Sanborn,

Donald W. Hamilton,

George W. LaMountain,

DeWitt C. Ramsey,

John H. Holt, jr.,

Marc W. Larimer,

Mahlon S. Tisdale,

Davis DeTreville,

Nelson W. Hibbs,

Wentworth H. Osgood,

John H. Falge,

Hugh C. Frazer,

Baylis F. Poe,

Ingram C. Sowell,

Francis E. M. Whiting,

Stanley G. Womble,

Charles A. Lockwood, jr.,

Charles S. Alden,

Hubert V. La Bombard, and

Leonard N. Linsley.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Arthur D. Struble,

Vincent H. Godfrey,

Donald MacL. Dalton,

Frank D. Wagner,

Armit C. Thomas,

John B. Kneip,

Marshall B. Arnold,

Irving R. Chambers,

Lloyd V. H. Armstrong,

Hubert E. Paddock,

Theodore E. Chandler,

Allan R. Wurtele,

Ryland D. Tisdale,

James P. Brown,

Edward Breed,



David McL. Collins,  
James M. Lewis,  
William D. Sullivan, and  
Richard S. Bulger.

Medical Inspector Charles E. Riggs to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

Medical Inspector Frank L. Pleadwell to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

Surg. Benjamin H. Dorsey to be a medical inspector with the rank of commander.

Surg. Lewis H. Wheeler to be a medical inspector with the rank of commander.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons with the rank of lieutenant commander:

George C. Thomas,  
Alfred L. Clifton,  
George F. Cottle,  
George B. Whitmore,  
Glenmore F. Clark,  
Joseph R. Phelps,  
Chandler W. Smith,  
William L. Mann, jr.,  
John G. Ziegler, and  
George A. Riker.

Dental Surg. Clark E. Morrow to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Dental Surg. Louis B. Lippman to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Dental Surg. Hyman Mann to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Dental Surg. Frank A. Zastrow to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Paymaster Eugene C. Tobey to be a pay inspector with the rank of commander.

Ensign Perry R. Taylor to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Civil Engineer Leonard M. Cox to be a civil engineer with the rank of commander.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:

Allen I. Seaman and  
John Gallagher.  
Pay Clerk Alexander C. Kozlowski to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Benjamin H. White to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Walter E. Morton to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk William J. Smith to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Floyd J. Farber to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Edison H. Gale to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Herman W. Johnson to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Percy J. Hutchison to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Maurice T. Scanlan to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Marcus E. West to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk John B. Daniels to be a chief pay clerk.  
Pay Clerk Michael J. Dambacher to be a chief pay clerk.

Lieut. (J. G.) Ernest C. Keenan, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (J. G.) Harry C. Ridgely, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Passed Asst. Surg. Judson L. Taylor, retired, to be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list.

The following-named assistant surgeons on the retired list of the Navy to be passed assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant on the retired list:

Rice K. McClanahan,  
Henry LaMotte,  
George M. Olson, and  
Arthur C. Stanley.

Asst. Paymaster Jacob D. Doyle, retired, to be a paymaster with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be chief boatswains on the retired list:

Hjalmar E. Olsen,  
Charles Wouters,  
Lee R. Boland, and  
William Johnson.

The following-named gunners on the retired list to be chief gunners on the retired list:

Henry J. Tresselt,  
Frank A. McGregor,  
Vista R. Thompson,  
Peter Hanley,  
Humboldt J. Palmer, and  
Theodore C. Wester.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be chief machinists on the retired list:

James L. Baart,  
August Anschuetz,

Herbert E. Kershaw,  
Joseph J. Duffy,  
Charles W. Jackson,  
George M. Heinen,  
John McPhee,  
William P. Little,  
Martin Casey,  
William C. Dronberger,  
William J. Powell,  
Edwin J. Cuthrell,  
James Wilson,  
Peter J. Hanlon,  
William E. B. Grant,  
Daniel J. McCarthy,  
Thomas F. Hobby, and  
Harlan B. Heath.

The following-named carpenters on the retired list to be chief carpenters on the retired list:

Benjamin D. Pender and  
Joel D. Griffin.

Sailmaker Herman Hansen, retired, to be a chief sailmaker on the retired list.

The following-named pharmacists on the retired list to be chief pharmacists on the retired list:

William H. Huntington and  
Isaac N. Hurd.

#### FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy for temporary service:

Edward Crouch,  
Daniel J. Sullivan,  
Edward J. Carr,  
Edwin W. Hill,  
Claude S. Padgett,  
Thomas F. Morris, and  
Walter B. Buchanan.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy for temporary service:

Roy Childs,  
Hardy M. James,  
Patrick J. Sullivan,  
William Crofut,  
George H. Toepfer,  
Luther C. Crow,  
William Kasburg, and  
Leo Kampman.

The following-named warrant officers, for temporary service, to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Frank McGlothlin,  
Wallace Hanna,  
John C. Redman,  
Frederick W. K. Mielke,  
Ewell K. Jett,  
Edward J. McCarthy,  
Leslie W. Beattie,  
Henry T. Husten,  
William McDade,  
Robert H. Barnes,  
Frank R. Wills,  
Joseph R. Laing,  
Charles D. Connor,  
Roy M. Dyer,  
William Province,  
Joshua W. M. Simmons, and  
Clyde H. MacDonald.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Bradford M. Meivin,  
Eugene Bastian,  
Marshall M. Angleton,  
Victor A. Leonard,  
Harold S. Vigab,  
Frank Gawrych,  
James A. Duryea,  
Richard Tainter,  
Ned P. Baugh,  
William J. Clark,  
George P. Hall,  
Herman H. Roloff, and  
Rudolph P. Bielka.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Linwood L. Curtis,  
Othmar L. Olsen,



Robert W. Ralston, and  
Arthur Bernstein.

Paymaster Elijah H. Cope to be a pay inspector with the rank of commander, for temporary service.

Acting Pay Clerk Samuel L. Bates to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Assistant Paymaster James Wilson, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Claude C. Hanan,  
Charles E. Leavitt,  
Harrison W. McGrath,  
Harry C. Mechtoldt,  
Henry J. Taylor,  
Charles W. Fox,  
William S. Cooper,  
Archie B. McKay,  
Josephus M. Lieber,  
George J. Schoonover,  
Otto E. Matheny, and  
Everett W. Brown.

The following-named assistant paymasters of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Forrest F. Fulton and  
John W. Mears.

The following-named officers to be assistant naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Herman R. Newby,  
Lott C. Newton, and  
Goldsboro Sessions.

Carpenter Emerson W. Amos to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Eichorn, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade), on the retired list, to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Alvah M. Smith,  
Charles C. Beach,  
Jesse E. Jones,  
John Westfall,  
Charles G. Wheeler,  
William G. A. Schwerin,  
Henry Feehan,  
John L. Kelley,  
Herbert J. Wiseman,  
Edgar A. Robie,  
Arthur Rogier,  
Edmund H. Klamt,  
William C. Stauffer,  
Norman McIntire,  
Daniel R. Shackford, and  
James Munro.

POSTMASTER,  
MICHIGAN.

Cornelius A. Bates, Marine City.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 15, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts unto Thee, O God our Heavenly Father, from whom cometh all strength, wisdom, and purity. Impart unto us, we beseech Thee, of these things sufficient unto our needs, that with all diligence and perseverance we may do whatsoever we are called to do, with unswerving fidelity to truth and justice. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman want to talk about for 10 minutes?

Mr. McFADDEN. I have a bill and a resolution that I am presenting this morning, in connection with a couple of matters which I should like to call to the attention of the House. I think the matter is rather important.

Mr. FOSTER. Can not the gentleman get along with five minutes?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will try to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to proceed for not more than five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill and joint resolution which I have offered are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15983) to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and the office of Comptroller of the Currency, and authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to perform the duties thereof.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency in the Treasury Department, and the office of Comptroller of the Currency be, and they are hereby abolished, except as hereinafter provided in this act.

SEC. 2. That the duties now imposed by law upon the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and upon the Comptroller of the Currency shall hereafter be performed under and by direction of the Federal Reserve Board; and all employees of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency now provided for by law shall be transferred to and hereafter be under the control and direction of the Federal Reserve Board, which board shall also disburse all appropriations for salaries and for other expenses of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and shall submit detailed estimates in its next annual report of the number of employees, their salaries, and of other necessary expenses for the administration of the duties hereby imposed upon it by said board.

SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

House resolution 578.

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a select committee of seven Members of the House, and that such committee be instructed to inquire into the official conduct of John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency, in his capacity as such comptroller, in the relationship thereof not only to the functions of said office as prescribed by law and by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury and by said Williams, but also in his official relationships to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of War, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to the Federal Reserve Board, to the War Finance Corporation, to the Capital Issues Committee, to the United States Shipping Board, and to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, respectively; said committee shall also inquire whether said Williams has any private banking connections or partnerships or otherwise interested in banking or brokerage concerns in the cities of Richmond, Va., or Baltimore, Md., or both, and what connection any or all of these have had in the past year with purchases or sales of stocks in International Mercantile Marine and Russian bonds or other securities, if any fiduciary or other relationship exists or has existed between such banks and the Richmond Federal reserve bank or its branch at Baltimore, Md. Said committee shall also inquire into the official conduct of said John Skelton Williams in his official capacity as Director of Finance and Purchases of the United States Railroad Administration. Said committee shall also inquire into the acquisition of sites for naval operations of any kind and report to the House whether, in their opinion, the said John Skelton Williams, while in said office of Comptroller of the Currency or in an official capacity directly, indirectly, or ex officio in connection with any other governmental office, commission, board, or agency, has been guilty of acts which were designed or calculated to overthrow, subvert, or corrupt the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof; and whether the said John Skelton Williams has been guilty of any act, or has conspired with others to do acts, which, in contemplation of the Constitution, are high crimes or misdemeanors, requiring the interposition of the constitutional powers of this House; and for such purposes said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, and shall have the right to report at any time.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I desire to take these few minutes to call the attention of the House to a bill and a resolution that I am putting in this morning. One is to abolish the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the other calls for an investigation of that bureau. I am prompted to do this because of several reasons. One of them comes in the form of a copy of a letter from John S. Fisher, the commissioner of banking of the State of Pennsylvania, to Richard L. Austin, agent of the Federal reserve bank at Philadelphia. He says:

A matter just came to my attention yesterday which I feel justified in mentioning to you. One of the trust companies of the State has been a depository for a number of years for one of the important railroad systems operating in the region. An officer of this company informs me that the Comptroller of the Currency has notified him that unless steps are taken by the 1st of February to convert the company into a national bank the railroad deposits will be removed to a national bank.

It seems to me that this is an unfortunate circumstance, and doubly so if it forecasts a fixed policy on the part of the comptroller. In the recent Government financial operations I am quite certain that the State institutions have done their full patriotic duty, just the same as the national banks. We are advised that there are to be further flotations of loans by the Government, and it seems to me untimely for the Government authorities to exercise any discrimination against the State institutions. If friction should arise as a result of such governmental policy, it is not difficult to anticipate that pressure may be brought to bear upon the State authorities to retaliate by removing State deposits to State institutions. In the past there has been no discrimination in this respect.

In addition to that I want to quote a letter from a banker who has this to say in regard to a similar situation just like I